

DA962

I7

The Irish Convention

As Proposed By
Premier David Lloyd George

The opinions of prominent Americans of Irish blood

Reprinted from
The Evening Post
New York

FRIENDS OF IRISH FREEDOM
26 Cortlandt Street
New York

IA 962
.17

FOREWORD

Capt. W. J. M. A. Maloney, a native of Ireland, who served for more than two years as a surgeon in the British Royal Army Medical Corps, wrote the first article in this pamphlet at the request of the Evening Post for the purpose of evoking discussion. Dr. Maloney saw service at the battle of the Marne and at the Gallipoli Peninsula, where he was wounded four times and invalided home.

The Evening Post (established in 1801) is by almost universal consent regarded as the ablest and most scholarly of American dailies. Throughout the war it has been intensely pro-Ally and many of its readers have felt that in the long struggle between England and Ireland the Post has been pronouncedly pro-English.

This symposium has been initiated and conducted throughout by the Post itself as a means of sounding the opinion of Americans of Irish blood.

(May 24, 1917)

THE PROPOSED IRISH CONVENTION

Opportunity, Desire, and Power to Compose the Troubles of Erin—Fate of the Effort Rests Ultimately with the Extremists—Where Do the Irish-Americans Stand?—Commission to Ireland Proposed

By CAPT. W. J. M. A. MALONEY.

CERTAIN Irishmen are about to be named to compose a convention which will draft a measure for the government of Ireland within the British Empire. This draft will be endorsed by Mr. Lloyd George and his Cabinet and will then be submitted for approval or rejection to the British Parliament. The calling of this convention is a cause of rejoicing to all Irishmen, for it concedes not only the principle that Ireland is a nation, but also the corollary to this principle—namely, that the government of Ireland is primarily the concern of the people of Ireland.

The calling of this convention seems to many of us, moreover, a valuable indication of sincerity in the expressed desire of the existing régime in England to settle the Irish question in conformity with Irish wishes. Most Irishmen are prepared, therefore, to regard this convention not with distrust—as if it were too good to be true—but with a deep sense of the responsibility which it places upon the people of Ireland at this most critical moment in the world's affairs.

No one pretends that a non-elected convention, held behind closed doors and under an alien chairman, is an ideal convention; but these are not ideal times for a convention, and generous recognition of the difficulties which attend England in this tentative effort at settlement in the midst of war is more in keeping with Irish standards than is suspicion of England's good faith. We have the Premier's assurance of England's need and desire for a settlement—and his offer of this convention.

Irreconcilables Condemn Themselves.

Irreconcilable minorities, whether Republican or Ulsterite, who without just cause refuse to participate in this convention of the people of Ireland merely condemn themselves and their cause before the bar of the world's opinion. The task which the convention undertakes is stupendously difficult if all the convened are pervaded by the spirit of compromise; it is frankly hopeless if even a minority of Irishmen refuse to coöperate for the welfare of Ireland.

No matter what the decision of the convention be, if the convention is so constituted that all Irish parties are justly represented within it, then Irishmen the world over must agree to abide faithfully by that decision. It is therefore now incumbent upon us to promote, so far as lies in our power, the just representation of the various Irish parties in that convention and to neglect no means by which harmony may be made to prevail there.

Mr. Redmond, whose present parliamentary strength is numerically three to four times greater than that of the Ulsterites, has magnanimously proposed to forego this advantage, to share numerical equality with the Ulsterites at the convention. This spirit is a good omen. Since it has so far become manifest might it not materialize further? Fifty-seven out of the 258 public bodies in Ireland—mainly elected of old by the Redmond machine—recently sent delegates to Count Plunkett's Republican convention in Dublin. Twenty to thirty others are alleged to have decided not to send delegates—only by the casting vote of the chairman. From one-fifth to one-third of the public bodies are therefore actively in sympathy with some phase, social, economic, or political, of the Republican programme. The chivalrous quality which led Mr. Redmond to waive his numerical superiority over his brethren in Ulster may now graciously lead him to make a similar renunciation on behalf of the Republicans.

More than equal representation at the convention neither the Ulster nor the Republican minorities can expect or seek. A convention composed of equal numbers of Nationalist, Republican, and Ulster representatives would be constituted as justly as is now possible without having recourse to an election. An election is apparently neither sanctioned nor contemplated in Ireland at present.

Restraining Influences Needed.

But another factor complicates this question of representation. Most of the Republican leaders are in jail. The wisest of them all, Prof. John McNeill, the man who, failing to prevent the Easter rising, yet succeeded in restricting it to Dublin, has just completed the first year of penal servitude to which he was condemned for his political activities. His restraining influence was never more sorely needed in Ireland than at this moment. A party deprived of its leadership in a convention no matter how great its numerical strength there, is a party without real and effective representation. As Mr. Redmond has stipulated and Mr. Lloyd George has promised that the convention will be truly representative of all shades of Irish opinion, the adjustment of this difficulty is doubtless now under consideration by these statesmen.

The Southern Unionists, the only remaining Irish party, return two members to Parliament. In so far as they are Unionists, their sentiment coincides with the Ulsterites, and they are in no need of special consideration. But in so far as they alone represent Episcopalian interests in Ireland, too great tenderness cannot be shown in their regard. Perhaps a separate committee of the convention, a committee consisting of clerical representatives of the Roman Catholic primacy, of the Episcopalian hierarchy, of the Presbyterian assembly, and of the other governing bodies of non-conformity in Ireland could, in these days when Christian unity is as vital an issue as national, best compose their difficulties outside of a political convention. The chambers of commerce and other industrial interests in Ireland, with their expert knowledge, perhaps might also better adjust their special claims in the harmony of a committee than in the chaos of an open debate.

Given Both Desire and Opportunity.

Given the desire for settlement, and the power to settle, there is nothing inherently impossible of settlement in the Irish situation. Conditions can be laid down by which every legitimate interest in Ireland will be adequately safeguarded. But, even with these conditions assured, will a settlement be reached? The decision rests entirely with the extremists. If these, Republicans or Reactionaries, believe themselves assured of support outside of Ireland, support from America or from England, support greater than their numbers or their claims merit, they may remain obstructive and recalcitrant, they may refuse all compromise, they may frustrate every attempt at settlement. It is, therefore, now of value to canvass Irish opinion in America, to place on record the attitude of Irish-Americans toward this convention, in order that Irish aims here may be defined, lest extremists, deluding themselves with false hopes, plan to defeat its purpose. No elaborate inquiries are necessary. Categorical answers to the following three questions would give all the information needed:

- (1.) **Are you in favor of a convention of the Irish in Ireland determining the plan of the future Government of Ireland?**
- (2.) **If that convention be arranged on a basis as equitable as is consistent with the present exigencies of war will you abide by its decisions.**
- (3.) **If the British Parliament legalizes these decisions, will you loyally and whole-heartedly co-operate with the Irish Government thus constituted?**

Information Necessary for Convention.

This information is necessary to the members of the convention. It is no less essential to the vast body of non-Irish opinion in America, for if Ireland ceases from being a cockpit for English politicians, there should be neither support nor tolerance here for mischievous agitators seeking then to convert it into a cockpit for intransigent Irish factions.

To show sympathy with the Russian people and to give what aid they may seek in counsel, an American Commission has been dispatched by President Wilson to Russia. The settlement of the

Irish question now is scarcely less important to the successful prosecution of the war than is the adjustment of difficulties in Russia. In Ireland, as in Russia, men engrossed in the problems among which they live are apt to lose their perspective, are apt to exaggerate inconsequential differences, forgetting that the world is at war. The people of Ireland in their existing confusion need advice and aid almost as urgently as our Russian allies. A deputation of eminent Irish-American Presbyterians is about to go to Ireland to place at the disposal of their Ulster brethren their wisdom in all matters upon which their counsel may be sought. This is an auspicious beginning. In wishing these patriotic and self-sacrificing gentlemen God-speed, one cannot help regretting that

the Irish in Ireland have not now by their side the leaders of Irish thought in this country and in Canada. Mr. Michael J. Ryan, of Philadelphia, the leader of the Nationalist party here; Supreme Court Justice Cohan, the leader of the Young Ireland movement; Justice Keogh, Mr. Victor Herbert, ex-Senator O'Gorman, Mr. Bainbridge Colby, and countless other Irishmen of distinction are available in this crisis. The sending now to Ireland of an American advisory commission adequately representing Irish opinion in this country would be deemed a gracious and a friendly act by the Irish people, would be of incalculable aid to the success of the convention, and would be the means of bringing the Irish question to a speedy and a permanent solution.

(May 25, 1917)

IRISH CONVENTION PLAN DISCUSSED

Those in Favor Say People Should Settle Future

DISTRUST OF ENGLAND VOICED

Suggestions of Captain Maloney in the "Evening Post" Draw Comment from Well-Wishers of Ireland Who Want to See a Fair and Just Settlement of Home Rule Problem.

Several Irishmen and Americans who are deeply interested in Ireland's welfare commented to-day for the *Evening Post* upon the suggestions set forth in this newspaper yesterday by Capt. W. J. M. A. Maloney, who, in discussing the proposed convention for the settlement of the Home Rule question, said it would be well "to place on record the attitude of

Irish-Americans toward this convention, in order that Irish aims here may be defined, lest extremists, deluding themselves with false hopes, plan to defeat its purpose."

Capt. Maloney served with the Medical Corps of the British army at Gallipoli, where he was severely wounded. He is now in this country recuperating from his wounds. Among those who discussed his article were the Rev. Father John J. Wynne, S.J., one of the scholars of the Roman Catholic Church in America; James A. O'Gorman, ex-United States Senator; Justice Daniel F. Cohan, of the Supreme Court, and W. Bourke Cockran, lawyer, who was born in Ireland. Other opinions will be published to-morrow.

"By all means let representatives of the Irish people, by means of a convention, propose what mode of government the Irish people want," said Father Wynne. "But the convention should represent the whole people, and be at liberty to consider in the open the views and claims of every element of the population."

"It would not be fair to convene political leaders, only, Nationalist, Republican, or Unionist. The mere fact that certain men have been party spokesmen in the past does not entitle them to express the actual sentiment of the people. Neither is this sentiment to be adequately learned from those who have been

undergoing political martyrdom since Easter, 1916. Much less can the few who speak for the sixth part of the population of the North presume to dictate to the overwhelming majority.

Irish Alone Not Interested.

"The Irish people and the British Government are not the only parties interested in the proceedings of such a convention. America is profoundly interested in it, and so is France, Russia is looking on, and Germany and Austria are not unobservant. The whole civilized world is looking to England for a square deal to Ireland. On that deal more than on any other factor hangs the result of this war.

"Why tell us we must send troops to France when even without the proposed convention, by the immediate application of the Home Rule measure now on her statute books, she could withdraw and devote to active service in France fully 100,000 of her best troops, immense quantities of ammunition, and recruit in short order from 300,000 to 400,000 of the best fighting men in the world!

"Two years ago it would have been easier to make such a convention thoroughly representative. It may not be too late to-day. The men at the head of the British Government do not inspire confidence in their ability to deal with this problem. Their treatment of the Sinn Fein movement shows that they know better how to provoke than to repress rebellion.

"England's sense of her absolute need of America, and the challenge of France for a square deal to Ireland may bring about a happy solution of this vexatious problem. Irishmen generally are justified in waiting for evidence of her sincerity before committing themselves to any whole-hearted promise of coöperation in a proposal which, for the moment, seems devised so as to throw upon Ireland the responsibility which really belongs to England."

Justice Cohalan Has Doubts.

Justice Cohalan doubted the good faith of the people of England toward the Irish convention. He said:

"There would be little difficulty in giving the answers evidently desired to the adroit questions of Dr. Maloney if the gathering to be called in Ireland were a

convention actually representative of the people of Ireland, and if there were any honest intention on the part of England to meet the viewpoint of the people when expressed by such a gathering.

"The manner in which the question of Home Rule has been treated, however, by the rulers of England, since the summer of 1914, to go no further back than the outbreak of the war, gives slight ground for believing Lloyd George's proposal to be anything but another English promise. And if we judge, as we must, in advance of the meeting, by the words of the authorized spokesman of the Government, rather than by the suggestions of the doctor, the assemblage is to be a conference, and not a convention.

"It is to be made up of men principally selected by the Unionist and Redmondite machines—both of which rest upon a greatly restricted franchise, and are sadly out of touch with the vital problems of Irish life. It is not to be elected by the people. It is to be presided over by a chairman to be imposed upon it by the Government, and its deliberations are to be conducted in secret behind closed doors.

"To expect that those who seek independence for Ireland would agree to be bound even by the demands of such a gathering—much less by the greatly attenuated grant of powers that would be left when Parliament finished with such demands—would be to believe that the people of Ireland were only playing at liberty, and even the English Government, after its recent experiences, does not longer deceive itself with that belief.

"That the majority of the people of Ireland want independence—and not some mere reforms of foreign misrule—is being made more and more manifest as is the fact that they are determined to have it. Seek proof of this not alone in the recent rising, but in the late elections in Roscommon, Longford, and Cork, and in the great convention held openly in Dublin last month, with its declaration in favor of total separation from England. Nor is the reason for this hard to find. Animated by the teachings and example of America, the hope of liberty for all peoples is in the air throughout the world, and if there is any compensation in sight for this dreadful war, it is in the world-wide conviction that henceforth

democracy in one form or another must rule all the world.

"The frightful sacrifices made on all sides can be paid for in no other way. Lloyd George's confession that Ireland is to-day as dissatisfied with English rule as it was in the days of Cromwell, and his knowledge of the very grave situation which confronts England, must be taken into account in deciding how much weight should be given to his latest suggestion for settling the problem of Ireland. He realizes, as does now Mr. Balfour, who is the real ruler of England, how essential it is for them to satisfy America of the sincerity of their position in this war.

Words Not Enough, He Says.

"With Ireland, held as she has been and is, no real lover of liberty can be convinced of the sincerity of English claims that they are fighting for the rights of the small nationalities. Hence this latest and most cunningly devised proposal by which they seek to attain their ends by appearing to be generous, when in fact they are not even just. Mere words, no matter how plausible, will not satisfy America. She will judge England by acts—not by professions.

"If England wants to gain the confidence of the world, let there be called a real convention of the representatives of Ireland. Let its members be elected by an honest plebiscite of the adult population of Ireland—not chosen by the present Parliamentary electors, with their restricted franchise and plural voting—but by the people at large. Let the convention choose its own chairman, even if he be Professor McNeill or one of the other intellectuals now imprisoned or interned by England. Let it conduct its deliberations publicly and decide fairly and fully what the future form of Government in Ireland is to be, and not alone will the people of Ireland cheerfully abide by the result, but all lovers of Ireland and of liberty throughout the world should be satisfied with it.

"In that direction lie not alone freedom and contentment for Ireland, and equality and fair play for all religions and parties therein, but conviction on the part of America of the sincerity of England, and with that conviction an added security and safety for England."

Ex-Senator O'Gorman's Views.

Ex-Senator O'Gorman, when interviewed at his office, 37 Wall Street, said:

"I believe Ireland is entitled to that measure of self-government which a majority of her people demand, and I sincerely hope that the deliberations of the proposed convention will accomplish that purpose. The Irish question must be settled by the people of Ireland.

"I have nothing to add to the views recently expressed by me in the *New York World*, in connection with the Home-Rule Symposium."

The statement to which Mr. O'Gorman refers appeared in the *New York World* of May 2, and is as follows:

"Great Britain has held for centuries a place of leadership among the great nations of the earth, but its statesmanship may well be reproached for its series of dismal failures in attempting to solve the Irish question. Penal laws, political and religious persecution, coercion, force, confiscation of estates, destruction of industries, and banishment have all been tried in vain. Is it not time to approach the consideration of the subject, animated by a spirit of fairness, justice, and conciliation?

"Even recently rebels in the north of Ireland have been rewarded with seats in the Cabinet, while rebels in the south have suffered instant death, some of them without trial.

"While no generation can place bounds upon the aspirations of a race, Americans believe that if Ireland enjoyed the same rights of self-government that have been granted to Canada and Australia, racial animosities would be obliterated and the distrust and hostility now separating the two countries would disappear and would be succeeded by a new relation based upon confidence, friendship, good-will, and imperial solidarity.

"What is now England's weakness would contribute to her strength and power. The wrongs and oppressions of the past may be forgiven, but not until England's sense of justice induces her to live up to her own confessions regarding the rights of small nations.

"An adjustment of the Irish problem on conditions demanded by the majority of the people of Ireland should not be a difficult task for statesmen capable of directing the destinies of the powerful

government with which we are now in alliance in an effort to make liberty and justice supreme throughout the world. To partition Ireland is to destroy the last hope of self-government to the Irish nation. The opinion of the average American regarding this question is clearly reflected in the memorable war message of President Wilson, when he declared that he would fight "for the rights of nations, great and small, and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience."

"Great Britain must grant self-government to Ireland some day. Why not now? Such an act of reparation will be tardy justice, but it will bring happiness to the Irish people and strength to the British Empire."

W. Bourke Cockran's Views.

W. Bourke Cockran, of 31 Nassau

Street, expressed himself as being in favor of a convention, if it were really representative of the Irish in Ireland, and if its decisions were ratified by all of the Irish at the polls. The convention, however chosen, might be competent to submit propositions to the Irish people, he said, but no convention chosen by the English Government could bind the Irish. He added:

"As to abiding by its decisions, if the convention be arranged on a basis as equitable as is consistent with the present exigencies of war, that depends upon how consistent with equity the constitution of the convention may be. If the exigencies of war render the constitution of the convention inequitable, I should not be for abiding by its decisions. If the acts of the convention are submitted to the people and approved by them, of course I'll support it."

(May 25, 1917)

REPRESENTATION IN THE IRISH CONVENTION

**PREMIER LLOYD GEORGE SAYS IT
IS NOT EASY TO DEFINE.**

**Expected Statement in Parliament
Postponed Until After Recess —
Appeal to All Irish Sections.**

LONDON, May 25.—On presentation of a motion to-day for adjournment of the House of Commons for the Whitsuntide recess, Premier Lloyd George said he was not in a position to give a definite reply as to the composition of the convention which is to attempt a settlement of the Irish question, but that it might be assumed the House and the Government had lost no time in getting into touch with the various parties, with a view to procuring a basis of representa-

tion which would carry out the scheme outlined by the Government.

"It is very important that the representation should be of a character which will command the confidence of the people of Ireland," he said. "It is not an easy matter to do so. There are a good many considerations which have had to be taken into account, and a good many interests to consider, and it is very desirable that the convention, when summoned, should be of a character which will make the people of Ireland feel that the Government has made a sincere effort to secure real representation of all views and aspects of the question."

The Premier said he had hoped to make a statement to-day, but that it would be a great mistake if, in order to make an announcement, the Government were to take unnecessary risks, and by that means alienate important bodies of opinion in Ireland. For that reason the Government had come to the conclusion that it would be better that no statement should be made as to negotiations which have not been completed. He continued:

"I sincerely trust, however, that there will be no prolonged delay. In fact, delay would be fatal. It might not only create unnecessary suspicion and distrust, but give the impression that the Government

Does not mean business. I therefore appeal to all sections of Ireland to assist the Government in coming to a speedy decision."

Mr. Lloyd George regretted that the Irish leaders had been compelled for

very important reasons to return to Ireland. With regard to John Redmond, all know that the reason why he was compelled to go home was that, although his health, happily, had been restored, he required recuperation.

(May 26, 1917)

MAKE-UP OF THE IRISH CONVENTION

More Comment on Lloyd George's Plan

VIEWS OF AMERICAN CRITICS

Belief Expressed that Coming Convention Is Doomed to Failure Unless Its Members Are Elected by the People and Truly Represent All Factions in the Country.

Several more well-wishers of Ireland defined their attitude to-day toward the proposed Irish Convention, commenting on the suggestions made by Capt. W. J. M. A. Maloney in the *Evening Post* and answering his three questions, which are published below. Among those who expressed their opinions were two Justices of the Supreme Court—John W. Goff and Edward J. Gavegan; also George J. Gillespie, a member of the State Charities Commission; John Devoy, editor of the *Gaelic American*, and a committee of the national officers of the Friends of Irish Freedom, consisting of Victor Herbert, Thomas Addis Emmet, and James K. McGuire.

Capt. Maloney's questions follow:

"(1.) Are you in favor of a convention of the Irish in Ireland determining the plan of the future government of Ireland?

"(2.) If that convention be arranged

on a basis as equitable as is consistent with the present exigencies of war, will you abide by its decisions?

"(3.) If the British Parliament legalizes these decisions, will you loyally and whole-heartedly coöperate with the Irish Government thus constituted?

Justice John W. Goff.

"The Irish have their faults as well as their virtues," said Justice Goff. "One of their faults is to accept with gratitude any promise that is made to them and appraise it at its face value. The unhappy history of their country is fraught with instances of bitter disappointment. Even a trusting people cannot be deceived by the proposal of Lloyd George. It is too transparent. Were it in fact a proposal to the Irish people to elect representatives to a convention for the purpose of drafting a constitution for the government of Ireland I would unhesitatingly answer the first question of the *Evening Post* in the affirmative.

"But it is not such a proposal. Instead it is a proposal for a convocation of government appointees from certain classes to meet in secret session under the presidency of a government-appointed chairman, who would direct and control its procedure. That is not a convention either in the American sense or the true sense of the word. The enthusiastic reception by Mr. Redmond of the proposal is not surprising. He is a loyal servant of the British Crown, and this is not the first time that his exuberant laudation was doomed to humiliating disappointment."

Views of Justice Gavegan.

Justice Gavegan's statement follows:

"(1.) Generally speaking, I am in favor of a convention of the Irish in Ireland determining the plan of the future government of Ireland, but I do not understand from Mr. Lloyd George's proposal that the British Government intends to give the Irish people any such opportunity.

"(2.) The convention should be arranged on a basis as equitable as is consistent with the *purposes* of the war which are of primary importance rather than with the *present exigencies* of the war which are only a secondary consideration.

"Those purposes being to destroy autocracy, to establish the principle of government based on the consent of the governed, and to secure the freedom and independence of the small nations, and Ireland being one of those small nations, the only 'equitable arrangement' for the proposed convention would be on the basis of actual representation. If that is done, if the convention is made up of delegates elected by the people and the principle of majority rule is applied to its proceedings, then all American friends of Irish freedom will abide by its decisions.

"(3.) If the British Parliament legalizes those decisions the Irish question will be solved.

"The familiar cry that 'the Irish can't agree,' resorted to by those who do not wish them to agree, is absurd on its face, unless it is intended to mean that they cannot agree to remain subjugated. They cannot agree so long as there is withheld from them the only means whereby a people is ever enabled to anywhere agree, namely, by means of the application of the democratic principle of the majority rule.

"Mr. Maloney's suggestion that an American advisory commission, adequately representing Irish opinion in this country, be sent to Ireland now, is a most excellent suggestion, and the gentlemen whom he names in that connection would be ideal representatives."

George J. Gillespie.

George J. Gillespie said he was in favor of a convention, but questioned whether the proposed one would represent the various elements of Ireland. He said he believed that the Irish were supremely capable of governing their own country, and should have the opportunity to demonstrate that ability.

"I am in favor of an Irish convention," said Mr. Gillespie, "but it is a grave question whether the one proposed will be so constituted that it will speak with inspiration, so that the various elements of the country will be fully represented.

If it is padded, if it is not truly representative, if the convention is not going to give an opportunity to the most zealous and earnest advocates to present their viewpoints, I am not in favor of it.

"As to the second question Mr. Maloney asks, whether if the convention be arranged on a basis as equitable as is consistent with the present exigencies of war, I will abide by its decisions, it is almost impossible to answer that question. The convention as it has already been outlined is to be held only to fixed prescriptions and fixed rules and methods of representation. These matters are not yet open to the public, and it is impossible for me to give an affirmative answer until I know just what the situation is. I am conscious that existing war conditions must be taken into consideration. Rules which are applicable now might not have to be made in times of peace.

"But it should be said that many people feel that the matter is not being taken up out of good-will by England, but out of necessity, which makes it difficult for many Irishmen throughout the world to give to her the credit that would be due her if she were acting in good faith. Mr. Lloyd George spoke the truth when he said those words about the work of restitution and reparation. But that duty has existed for so many years that it is painful to think of it.

"As for Mr. Maloney's third question: 'If the British Parliament legalizes these decisions, will you loyally and wholeheartedly coöperate with the Irish Government thus constituted?' there is no use in answering that question till more light is shed on the other two.

"Assuming that England wants to do the right thing and will let the Irish people—and I mean the people, not representatives of this or that clique, or faction, or section—settle things for themselves, I think the proposal for a convention a splendid forward move. For I am one who believes that the Irish people are supremely capable of governing their own country, and that it's their right to be given the opportunity to demonstrate that ability."

John Devoy's Statement.

John Devoy said in his statement:

"I recognize the good-will and zeal for Ireland which prompt Mr. Maloney's

article, but I cannot agree with his premises. It requires absolute forgetfulness of Ireland's past and failure to recognize the hard, indisputable facts of the present situation to justify generous recognition of the difficulties which attend England in the tentative effort at settlement in the midst of war. The Premier's assurance of England's need and desire for a settlement, viewed in the light of his recent exhibitions of bad faith, and of the whole conduct of his colleagues since the worthless little Home Rule act was placed on the Statute Book, and then promptly suspended, is, to my mind, utterly worthless. And if it were worth all his words mean, it gives no assurance as to what the British Parliament will do with any recommendation the proposed conference, misnamed a convention, may make.

"Mr. Maloney's statement that 'no one pretends that a non-elected convention, held behind closed doors, and under an alien chairman, is an ideal convention' is a conclusive reason for refusing to accept it, and nullifies his subsequent plea in its favor. It also effectually refutes his contention that 'irreconcilable minorities, whether Republican or Ulsterite, who, without just cause, refuse to participate in this convention of the people of Ireland, merely condemn themselves and their cause before the bar of the world's opinion.' That is a wholly untenable doctrine. He admits that the convention, as outlined by Lloyd George, would not represent the people of Ireland, and then insists that those who neither believe in its object nor trust the men who call it—and who will undoubtedly control its deliberations—deserve the world's condemnation for remaining away.

"The Irish Unionists are opposed to home rule in any form; why should they be condemned for refusing to go into a convention to draft a plan of home rule? The British Government should be condemned for placing the wishes of the minority above those of the majority, but the minority have a right to their opinions. Where they are wrong is in refusing to abide by the decision of the majority.

"The other 'extremists,' the republicans, demand complete national independence—total separation from England—why should they be condemned for refus-

ing to help to perpetuate the connection with England, which they believe is responsible for all the ills of Ireland?

"There are many admirable things in Mr. Maloney's article—his plea for conciliation of all Irish parties and elements and for the release of John MacNeill, for instance—but the one question to be decided is, whether a conference called on Lloyd George's plan, dominated by the British Government and two political machines, one of which has lost its grip on the people, and having no elective feature, has any right to speak for the people of Ireland.

"And the equally important question follows: Why should the people of Ireland and the Irish abroad buy 'a pig in a bag' by committing themselves beforehand to a programme of which they know nothing and with which the British Parliament will later do as it pleases, without any regard to its merits or the wishes of the Irish people? If it were to be a convention elected by the whole adult population of Ireland, the case would be different. Such a convention would be a constituent assembly; its decisions would be binding on the Irish people, would constitute their demand on England, and would remain as their bill of rights until England granted it in full.

"These observations do not categorically answer Mr. Maloney's three questions, but they do so in substance. I am a separatist and a republican, but even if I believed this solution of the Irish question to be impossible under present circumstances and were looking for 'the next best thing,' I would be irrevocably opposed to accepting the decisions of a body convened and dominated on the plan outlined by Lloyd George in the House of Commons last Monday. But I do not believe that solution to be impossible. On the contrary, I am very hopeful, although in my seventy-fifth year, that I shall live to see the establishment of an Irish republic."

Friends of Irish Freedom.

The statement of the Committee of Friends of Irish Freedom follows:

"Excluding from consideration the intensive and highly colored statements which have been cabled to the newspapers, manifestly designed to influence public opinion in America; also excluding

the fervid declarations of Members of Parliament, there is but one concrete proposal made by the responsible Minister of the Crown that can form basis for any intelligible comment.

"This proposal reduced to simple terms, is: (a) That, because of the failure of all attempts to arrive at a settlement on proposals which emanated from a British Government, the present Government invites Irishmen themselves to put forward their proposals; (b) for that purpose, the Government proposes to summon a convention of Irishmen to submit a constitution for the Government of Ireland within the Empire; (c) the convention will be representative of the local governing bodies, the churches, the trade unions, the commercial and educational interests, and Sinn Feiners; (d) the basis of representation from the various bodies, and the method of selection of the representatives, are undetermined, but from the context it is reasonably inferable that the Government is to appoint the delegates; (e) the convention is to be held behind closed doors, and the chairman is to be appointed by the crown; (f) nothing but special war considerations would induce the Government to take up the settlement of the Irish question at this time.

"A fair and impartial analysis of the foregoing provisos will convince the unprejudiced mind that the proposal to allow a convention of Irishmen to adopt a constitution for the government of their country is illusory and deceptive, for the following reasons:

"(1.) It excludes all means and opportunity for the adult population of Ireland to give free and unrestricted expression of feeling and opinion.

"(2.) It limits representation to certain public bodies, professions, interests, and classes, which in the majority of cases are either under Government control or susceptible to its influence.

"(3.) It in no sense can be a representative body with a mandate from the people to speak for them, since its members will be Government appointees, and consequently care will be taken that a majority will represent the Government.

"(4.) The inclusion of the miscalled Sinn Feiners is a specious semblance of generosity, since among their bravest and most gifted are those condemned to imprisonment, whose voice and influence would be as useful and potential as were the voice and influence of the warring Boers who were invited to council in South Africa.

"(5.) A convention chairman appointed by the Government would to all intents and purposes be a governmental instrument, having in his hands the whole machinery of the convention, the formulation of rules and procedure, the use of arbitrary power without responsibility, and by reason of the secrecy surrounding the proceedings, the authority to suppress free discussion and bar public criticism, so essential to a constructive deliberative body.

"We therefore regard the proposal as an insidious pretence, impracticable in its operation, and, because of its lack of democratic honesty, foredoomed to failure.

"As Americans we assert and believe that in doing so we are in harmony with sound public opinion in America; and that, if England be sincere, in the words of Lloyd George, that she 'would not forget that restitution and reparation began at home,' she will concede to the Irish people the right to elect their own representatives, that those representatives shall have the right to elect their own chairman, and conduct their proceedings in the light of day, frame the Government the people of Ireland want, and that the constitution which they may draft for the government of Ireland will be promptly accepted and enacted by the Parliament of England."

(May 28, 1917)

IRISH CONVENTION PLAN WINS FAVOR

Viewed by Lawyer as Real Opportunity

FAITH IN ENGLAND'S SINCERITY

**Redmond's Method of Procedure Urged
by One Who Opposes Partition of
the Island—Irish-Americans Might
Help Draft Constitution, Says John
J. O'Connell—Dr. Emmet's Views.**

Capt. W. J. M. A. Maloney's challenge to Irish-Americans and friends of Ireland that they assist in the settlement of Ireland's difficulties by putting themselves on record in regard to the proposed convention for the settlement of the Home Rule problem, "in order that Irish aims here may be defined, lest extremists, deluding themselves with false hopes, plan to defeat its purpose," drew more comment to-day from readers of the *Evening Post*.

One of those who gave their opinion was John J. O'Connell, a lawyer of 31 Nassau Street, and New York County chairman of the Progressive party. Mr. O'Connell contends that the Irish people should rise to the opportunity which has been offered to them, and maintains that the attitude of John Redmond, leader of the Irish Nationalists, is a correct one.

Capt. Maloney's questions, which were published in the *Evening Post* of May 24, follow:

"(1.) Are you in favor of a convention of the Irish in Ireland determining the plan of the future government of Ireland?

"(2.) If that convention be arranged on a basis as equitable as is consistent with

the present exigencies of war, will you abide by its decisions?

"(3.) If the British Parliament legalizes these decisions, will you loyally and whole-heartedly coöperate with the Irish Government thus constituted?"

Mr. O'Connell's response to Capt. Maloney follows:

Believes British Are Sincere.

"This is the first time in the history of Ireland that the British Government has given the people of Ireland an opportunity of framing their own Constitution. The people ought to rise to the occasion, by which I mean people of all shades of political thought, all creeds, and of whatever lineage. It is no time to dwell on the persecutions of the past; it is eminently a time to look to the rising sun of the future. I believe that the British Government is sincerely and honestly putting the reins in the hands of the Irish people, so that they themselves may do their own driving.

"While the Irish people are sentimental and have long memories, still a future cannot be built up on the recollection of oppressions of the past. It is a time when all classes and sections of the Irish people should get together to adjust their own problems; and they should do it in a spirit of conciliation, in a spirit of sincere regard for one another's hopes and, indeed, for one another's fears. It is not a time for ultimatums or for laying down lines of irreducible minimums. There is now an opportunity, and they ought to rise to it.

"Personally, it is my belief that there is no need for a division or partition of the island, and that there should be none. It is probably true that large numbers of the Orangemen of Ulster—and I use that term not in any invidious sense—have honest fears that a parliament in Dublin, legislating for the whole island, might abridge or destroy their civil and religious rights, and might discriminate against their particular industries or against particular localities. I am not taking into account anybody who is advancing those theories for the sake of political advantage, but take it for granted that there are many men who hold such fears honestly.

Against a State Church.

"The basic rule of democracy is government by a majority, but minorities

must be protected in what we in America call their inalienable rights. Minorities must have religious freedom the same as the majority, and, likewise they must have industrial freedom and be protected from class legislation or discriminating legislation. America has shown that written constitutions protect these rights absolutely, and I cannot see why the Ulster Orangemen cannot be perfectly protected by constitutional provisions guaranteeing for all time religious liberty, preventing for all time the establishment of a state church, and preventing the passage of laws which will discriminate for or against any particular persons, localities, or industries. In this way, absolute equality to all can be assured, and a government of the people can only exist where there is absolute equality.

"In a convention such as that proposed for a decision on those subjects, ordinarily a set of elected delegates, based on the franchise and on population, would be the best method to decide those questions. That is the way in which constitutional conventions are held in this country. But we have had over a century of that kind of government, whereas this is the first proposition of the kind for Ireland. There are many currents and cross-currents there, born of conditions that never existed in this country. There has been the contention on one side that particular sections and particular industries have been colded, and that the descendants of the "planters" have always been given vastly more than their share of "rights." There is now the feeling on their part, very naturally, that some of those "rights" may be taken away from them.

"A purely elective system of selecting the delegates would not result in sending to the convention these various shades of thought. You would have, perhaps, three shades of thought represented, viz.: the home-rule Nationalist thought, the Sinn Féin thought, and the viewpoint of the Carsonites. That would be a division entirely on present-day political grounds, and would not be fair, in my opinion. There are large numbers of Protestant Irish who could hardly be classed under any one of the three. There are large numbers of the Catholic clergy who could not be classed under any of the three. There are various agricultural, manufacturing, and financial in-

terests whose viewpoint would not squarely come within any of the three.

"I believe, therefore, that the proposition as outlined by Mr. Redmond in his reply to Lloyd George's speech is the correct one, and the one which would be the most effectual in bringing things to a successful conclusion.

"For my own part, I believe that the island should not be divided; that the Dublin Parliament should be given broad powers to legislate for the entire island—should have as much power, indeed, as is given to the Commonwealth of Australia and to the Dominion of Canada, and that the rights of the minority should be protected in some such manner as that indicated above, and in such a way that a majority cannot at any time take away any of their rights. I do not think that an American commission, advisory or otherwise, ought to be sent to the convention. This grave question is one for the Irish in Ireland themselves. If, however, the convention did decide that safeguards should be written into the Constitution to protect the rights of the minority, then those of Irish blood in this country who are familiar with the Constitutions and the laws of the United States could render considerable help by furnishing drafts of provisions which have been found effective on this side of the water. This would not be taking part in the deliberations, but, in a way, furnish what might be called expert suggestions as to means for reaching the desired result.

The fact that the sessions of the convention are to be in secret should not be disquieting. While it is true that all constitutional conventions here are usually in the open, still all committee meetings, where the real work is done, are in secret. Very likely, the provisions for secret sessions is to prevent its deliberations from being overridden by noisy galleries and to insure absolute freedom of discussion."

Another who voiced his opinion was Dr. Thomas Addis Emmet, who will celebrate his ninetieth birthday to-morrow at his home, Madison Avenue and 29th Street.

Dr. Thomas Addis Emmet.

"There is no hope for Ireland until she has become a separate country," Dr. Emmet said.

Despite his great age Dr. Emmet says that his mind is as keen as it was fifty years ago. He spends from three to five

nours every morning, working in bed, on the revision of his life work, 'Memoirs of Thomas Addis and Robert Emmet with their Ancestors and Immediate Family.' To this work he referred for his opinion on the Irish question. "I write as an American, not as an Irishman," he said, "and I treat that subject as I should criticise the French Revolution." The passages to which he referred appear in the historical introduction as follows:

"The author's earliest recollection of any knowledge of Irish affairs is the expression of his father's opinion that Ireland could have no prospect of a bright future until she should have gained full management of her own affairs, and that desideratum, he was confident, could only be obtained after a total separation from England. Few realize the truth of Aubrey de Vere's statement that with a free people—'A nation forms its institutions as a shell fish forms its shell, by a sort of slow exudation from within which gradually hardens as an external deposit, and must therefore be fitted to the shape of that which it invests and protects.' England's form of government is best fitted for her people and would be worth-

less for any other nation. The shell or the clam would be no more suitable for the oyster than would the oyster's shell for the clam, nor could either be expected to thrive under the protection of that meant for the lobster.

"At one time we owed legally such an obligation to England but it was never merited by the so-called 'Mother Country'; she certainly neglected her American colonies, leaving them to shift for themselves until through their own effort they had prospered sufficiently to be worth robbing, and the attempt then made to fit us to England's shell caused our separation. A similar result must follow the attempt in Ireland.

"For sixty years the writer was engaged in helping the Irish people financially and yet his own convictions politically were never in full accord with the majority. Yet in no instance did he ever exercise any political influence, holding that every individual should decide for himself. The writer has had many warm friends where we were only in accord with love for Ireland as a whole—with the exception of the Orangemen with whom nothing could be held in common."

(May 29, 1917)

IRISH CONVENTION GAINS ADVOCATES

Plans of Settlement Fa- vored by Irish-Americans

OPPOSE DIVISION OF COUNTRY

**William J. Guard Comments on the
Ulster Problem — Cites Religious
Questions in France and Italy —
Martin Conboy Believes American
Opinion Will Have Weight.**

Advocates of Irish self-government continue to respond to the challenge of Capt. W. J. M. A. Maloney that their attitude toward the proposed convention for the settlement of the Home Rule

question be put on record. "Given the desire for settlement and the power to settle," Captain Maloney contends, "there is nothing inherently impossible of settlement in the Irish situation." But the success of the convention, Captain Maloney maintains, rests largely upon the acceptance by Irish-Americans of this opportunity for constructive coöperation. With the purpose of obtaining the opinions of Irishmen and Americans on the proposed convention, Captain Maloney suggested the following questions in the *Evening Post* of May 24:

"(1.) Are you in favor of a convention of the Irish in Ireland determining the plan of the future government of Ireland?

"(2.) If that convention be arranged on a basis as equitable as is consistent with the present exigencies of war, will you abide by its decisions?

"(3.) If the British Parliament legalizes these decisions will you join loyally and whole-heartedly coöperate with the Irish Government thus constituted?"

The shortest reply received to-day to these questions came from the Rev.

Father Signourey W. Fay, of the New-
man School at Hackensack, N. J. He
answered "Yes," to each question.

William J. Guard.

Another one who gave his views was
William J. Guard, publicity secretary of
the Metropolitan Opera Company and
author of "The Soul of Paris" and "The
Spirit of Italy." He spoke as an Ameri-
can of Protestant Irish nativity. His
father, the Rev. Thomas Guard, who was
a prominent Methodist minister of Balti-
more and San Francisco, was an advo-
cate of Home Rule.

"I do not favor the division of Ireland,"
Mr. Guard said: "To cut off Ulster from
the rest of Ireland would be like taking
New York city out of New York State.
I believe that much of the trouble is
due to the bigotry of Orangemen who
represent the extreme of Protestantism.
Many of them imagine even now that the
first move of the Irish Catholics will be
to bring the Pope there. Of course, I
realize the bigotry of both sides. That
is why, as a Protestant, I condemn the
Orangemen. One of the great curses of
Ireland is ecclesiasticism; it is as big a
curse as militarism and whiskey, and
must go with them.

"Ireland should be permitted to elect
delegates to a constitutional convention
by universal suffrage, including the men
in the trenches and the rebels in jail. As
far as possible all clerical influence
should be prohibited.

Attitude of Ulster.

"I see no reason why Ulster should
fear union with the south of Ireland. She
will always be able to profit in elections
by the split in the majority vote. France
and Italy are Catholic countries which
have got rid of their clericalism, and why
shouldn't Ireland? I believe thoroughly
in the Home Rule principle."

Mr. Guard offered the above as his
answer to the first question of Capt.
Maloney, but thought that the second
and third questions should be reserved
for citizens of Ireland alone, since they
had no bearing on Americans.

Martin Conboy.

Martin Conboy, of 27 Pine Street, a
law partner of former United States At-
torney-General John W. Griggs, believes
that American opinion on the Irish ques-

tion should be offered to Great Britain as
advice from one partner to another. He
considers a settlement to be one of the
paramount issues of the war. He spoke
of the many men of Irish birth who had
fought in the Civil War, and told of a
regiment called the Irish Rifles, of which
his father was a member, which joined
the side of the North. Americans, he
said, may have the opportunity to repay
at the present time, by pressure of opin-
ion, the debt incurred in that struggle.

When asked his opinion of the propo-
sals for the convention, Mr. Conboy
said that as outlined they did not pro-
vide for a representative convention. If
this convention was to draft a constitu-
tion without the consent of the whole
people, he feared strife would follow. He
was sure that if the American thirteen
colonies felt the grievance so great that
they would fight on a tax issue, they
would certainly have opposed a Consti-
tution imposed upon them in the same
manner. This, he believed, was the situa-
tion in Ireland. Mr. Conboy's statement
follows:

"The Irish question, at this particular
juncture in American affairs, appeals to
all Americans, whether of Irish extrac-
tion or not, because of its bearing on
America's entrance into the war. That
there is a relation between the two things
cannot be questioned. First, because it
is impossible to conceive of democracy in
the abstract if democracy in Ireland is
denied in the concrete. Second, and this
is a corollary to the first, because it is
impossible to conceive of world-peace if
Ireland is not at peace, even though the
rest of the world is. In short, world de-
mocracy minus Ireland is not democracy,
and there can be no world-peace if Ire-
land is fighting for the vindication of
her right to be a democracy.

Americans Interested.

"And in the third place, with so many
millions of Irish birth and extraction in
the United States it becomes of great im-
portance to the success of America in
the war that those millions shall not be
deprived of any of the incentives that
inspire every other man to give his all,
and to do his utmost for the safety of de-
mocracy.

"America is preparing to carry on this
war to a conclusion. She will contribute

the fortunes and the lives of her sons, No mean part of that contribution will come from her sons of Irish birth and extraction. They will respond as they have always done, and for the success of America in arms. Their response should not be chilled by the knowledge that the principle for which they are required to sacrifice themselves is denied application to Ireland alone, that the integrity of small nations excludes Ireland, that world democracy excludes Ireland, and that the world peace that is to follow this war, and which will rest upon the secure foundation of world democracy will prevail everywhere except in Ireland.

"England lost this continent because she would not recognize the principle for which we have engaged in this war. It was a great loss, but she may sustain a greater, for, if, while now professing recognition of and devotion to that principle, she refuses it application, her professions will be valued by her practice, and she cannot be accepted as a democratic nation. But, more than this, it is neither fair nor right, nor shall it be that she shall tie our hands in this war; for, just as we could not exist as a nation half bond and half free, neither can we acclaim a democracy that excludes from

its operation the land that next to this is dearest to millions of Americans.

"I have at home a bronze medal of honor. Its legend is that it was awarded by the Congress of the United States for distinguished conduct at the battle of Williamsburgh, May 12, 1862. When my father earned it he was serving in a regiment known as the Irish Rifles. It is unnecessary to comment upon his loyalty or upon the spirit of that regiment. I wonder if he did not feel when fighting to strike the shackles from the slave that there was a singular appropriateness in the regimental title?

"Can we Americans say this to England without offence? Undoubtedly. We are allies-partners in this war, and the Irish question, which is really the democracy question, is as much an issue with which we are all concerned as are the rights of Belgium or Servia. More so; for a man should put his house in that order which he seeks to impose upon his neighbor before attempting to impose it upon his neighbor."

The *Evening Post* is in communication with a number of prominent Irish-Americans, and will publish their replies to the Maloney questions as they are received.

(May 31, 1917)

IRISH CONVENTION AND ITS DELEGATES

Basis of Representation Discussed

LLOYD GEORGE PLAN CRITICISED

Victor Herbert, Justice Peter A. Hendrick, and Dr. John G. Coyle Give Their Views on Proposed Method for Setting Irish Issue — Question of England's Sincerity.

As the symposium conducted by the *Evening Post* to determine the attitude of well-wishers of Ireland toward the proposed Irish convention is developed,

it is apparent that conflicts are giving way to agreements, and the sincerity of each group, even those farthest apart, is appreciated by its opponents. Most of the factions agree that a representative convention is desirable. They differ regarding the degree of representation the proposed convention will assure.

Victor Herbert holds that an analysis of Lloyd George's proposal shows it to be undemocratic and raises a doubt as to England's sincerity in declaring that she is fighting for small nations. Dr. John G. Coyle believes the convention will soften antagonism and lead to a final settlement. Justice Peter A. Hendrick, of the Supreme Court, believes the value of the convention depends upon the measure of freedom the delegates are allowed; any attempt by England to dominate the meeting will, he says, not be acceptable in this country.

Capt. W. J. M. A. Maloney, in suggesting the symposium in the *Evening Post* of May 24, proposed the following

questions to Irish-Americans and friends of Irish self-government:

"(1.) Are you in favor of a convention of the Irish in Ireland determining the plan of the future government of Ireland?

"(2.) If that convention be arranged on a basis as equitable as is consistent with the present exigencies of war, will you abide by its decisions?

"(3.) If the British Parliament legalizes these decisions, will you loyally and whole-heartedly coöperate with the Irish Government thus constituted?"

Victor Herbert's Views.

In answer Victor Herbert has written:

"It has been made so clear from the analyses of the proposed gathering already published, that it is not in any American sense to be either a convention or a body clothed by the Irish people themselves with any delegated power, that I shall not take any time to discuss that phase of the question.

"In my opinion Lloyd George has erred in this matter from over-shrewdness. He cannot appoint any group of men, no matter how eminent they may be, who can settle the Irish question. The Irish people themselves intend to settle the Irish question and no settlement unsatisfactory to the majority of them will be a real or permanent settlement. When they make their decision I have no doubt that it will be fair to all groups of Irishmen, no matter what may be their religion or their policies or their strain of blood.

"But that is not the important question at this moment. Now the whole world, and America especially, is interested in this matter as a war question. England has declared that she is fighting for the small nations and for the rule of democracy, and some Americans appear to believe that claim. But the mass of the American people are looking for some concrete proof of the truth of that claim and their eyes are fixed on Ireland while waiting for that proof.

"Is England in earnest? Her actions will tell and America awaits her action. If she gives freedom to Ireland she will give concrete evidence of sincerity. If she fails to do so, no matter how ingenious her excuse may be, the heart of America will turn from her and that will

not help England in this the hour of her greatest crisis.

"It is a question that England must decide, but it is of the greatest importance to our country, now that we are engaged in this colossal war, that England should not add another to her long record of failures to understand or defer to American opinion."

Dr. John G. Coyle.

Dr. John G. Coyle, of 226 East 31st Street, an active official of the United Irish League, gave his views as follows:

"I am heartily in favor of holding the Irish convention, and am one of the many who believe that it can be and will be arranged for equitable representation of various groups, and will cheerfully support the decision of the majority of such a convention.

"There are three well-marked opinions in Ireland. One is the Sinn Feiners, who desire complete independence and believe that the present crisis is opportune in making such a demand more likely of fulfilment. They are prepared to revolt, if need be, but think just now that Great Britain might be compelled to cede Ireland complete independence.

"A second group is the Unionists, who wish close union with Great Britain, rule by the Imperial Parliament, and profess the most intense loyalty and attachment to Great Britain. But for the determined attitude of these Unionists of Ulster, home rule for all Ireland would have been in operation long ago.

"The third group is the Nationalists, who wish independence, but believe that it is not possible just now, and are ready to accept autonomy, or the largest measure of home rule obtainable which provides for an Irish Executive, an Irish Parliament, and control of Irish politics, Irish industries, and administration.

"The Unionists of Ulster are chiefly Orangemen, whose opposition is largely due to religious hatred, but also to a genuine dislike of the mass of the Irish people.

As to Nationalists.

"The Nationalists embrace men of all creeds in Ireland. The Sinn Fein element is a growing body, whose components are not stable or settled, but whose sentiment has been greatly intensified by the delay in home rule, the revolt of

1916, the arrests, imprisonments, deportations of rebels and sympathizers, the breakdown of the Asquith Government, the operation of martial law, and the accession to power and high Cabinet posts of such men as Sir Edward Carson and Bonar Law, who were solemnly covenanting but three years ago to shed their blood against the operation of a statute of Parliament, and have gone not only unpunished, but rewarded by place, honor, and power.

"The proposed Irish Convention, if conducted with deliberation, permitting every element represented the fullest latitude of expression and freedom of speech, will bring together these opposing elements, with the gaze of the world upon them. Heat and antagonisms will soften under full expression, discussions between sessions, the play of mind on mind, the recognition of the sincerity of the purposes of each group, the realization that Unionists and Nationalists are serving the Empire in unity on the battlefield, and the thousand little factors which will permit reason and sense to replace antagonism and opposition as men are thrown more and more in contact with each other.

"That the Irish problem is before them for solution, that they have the opportunity to solve it and begin a new career for Ireland now, that Irishmen have succeeded in all parts of the world in governmental and other tasks of magnitude, that settlement means speedier peace in Europe and a new era for Ireland, will all contribute to influence the mass of the convention after the first heats and flashes have been given full play.

"Discordant elements in a convention in South Africa finally came out of the convention with a constitution which solidly united the various groups in those colonies and in the former Orange Free State and Transvaal Republic, so that in this great war, the vast majority of the former enemies of Great Britain served her cause in the field and in the administration nobly and well.

"Discordant elements in our own Constitutional Convention of 1787, with Rhode Island failing to take any part, through jealous fears, finally united in a framework of government, which we proudly call our Constitution, and our people have remained united except in

the great struggle of 1861-65; have absorbed many races since, and have succeeded in keeping government stable.

Can Solve Problem.

"There is every hope that the Irish convention can and will solve the problem of an Irish Government. Great Britain has at last confessed what the world has been long able to see—that she cannot govern Ireland.

"Ireland, despite the rancors of the groups, is a nation. Geographically and ethnically, the people are a true nation. They are one of the oldest in Europe. The capacity of the Irish has been so often shown, in nearly all of the great avenues of achievement open to men, that the world may rely upon them to solve their own problem, if they are but given free hand to do so. That they can and will do so is the belief of every sympathizer with Ireland."

Justice Peter A. Hendrick's statement is published below in full:

Justice Peter A. Hendrick.

"We Americans have a vital interest in a just solution of the Irish question. The American people do not approve, nor have they ever approved, of the manner in which England has governed Ireland. We believe that all governments should be based on the consent of the people governed.

"Ireland is a nation distinct from England—as distinct as Hungary is from Austria. It is a small nation. It has been governed heretofore by force and in defiance of the will of her people. Americans naturally look with suspicion on any proposition of the English Government in relation to Ireland, and there will never be cordial relations between the American people and the English Government until such time as England manifests an honest purpose to grant to the Irish people the right to govern themselves.

England's Sincerity.

"If, however, the English Government is in earnest in its present proposition to grant self-government to Ireland, and if it is honest in its expressed desire to leave the form of that government to be determined by the Irish people, and if it allows the Irish people to convoke a convention which shall honestly represent the will of the people, and if it will put

in force the scheme of government adopted by a convention so composed, then America will believe that at last England is granting some measure of justice to Ireland. Whether or not the present proposal is honest, or whether it is another subterfuge to deceive and to trifle with the people of Ireland and the world at large, remains to be seen. It is not strange that many doubts of the sincerity of the English Government are openly expressed in this country.

The American Idea.

"The American thought would be that the delegates to the proposed convention should be elected by the people; that the delegates so assembled should be free to choose their own officers and free to discuss the proposed form of government. Those delegates, according to the American idea, should be elected by all the communities of Ireland and a majority of the delegates should determine the form of government. If, however, it should appear that the English Government dominates or endeavors to prescribe the character of the delegates, or to dominate in any way the deliberations of the convention, the results, whatever they may be, unless satisfactory to the Irish people themselves, will not be accepted in this country as an evidence of England's good faith.

"Any action which would indicate that the English Government is standing behind a small minority of the people for the purpose of over-riding the will of the great majority, will stamp the whole proposition as insincere and misleading. If a free convention, the delegates to which are elected by a free expression of the will of the Irish people, shall adopt a form of government for Ireland, and the English Government will see that that form of government is put into operation in Ireland, then American opinion will be satisfied. If not, the talk of the solicitude of England for the rights

of small nations, which is so largely dis-trusted in this country, will be regarded as another instance of England's bad faith. Let us hope for the best—a free convention and the enforcement by England of the free expression of the will of the majority.

Right of a People to Rule.

"America has the deepest interest in the proper solution of this question. We are now engaged in common with the Allies, of which England is one, in a war which, from our viewpoint, is a war for the perpetuation of democratic government—of the right of the people to rule themselves, as distinguished from the right of the Government to rule the people. There is our interest, and if any ally, by its action, refuses to coincide with our ideals in that regard, but is prosecuting the war for its own selfish purposes, the American people will not be slow to understand, and any coöperation with such a nation will cease upon the accomplishment of the purposes for which America is now at war.

"I have said that it is of the highest importance to America that the Irish question be justly settled. Practically one-fifth of our population is of Irish birth or extraction. The citizens composing that element have the respect and good-will of the whole mass of their fellow citizens. It is to the interest of America that the rights of a small nation which is so closely allied to us in good-will and deeds should have justice, especially when our citizenship of Irish birth or descent has contributed so vastly toward our freedom, and toward the foundation and the preservation of our Government, and has contributed so largely to the development of our country. At this present moment every American knows that every American citizen of Irish birth or of Irish descent will unhesitatingly lay down his life for the welfare of America."

(June 1, 1917)

IRISH CONVENTION MUST LOOK TO FUTURE

Has Nothing to Do with Past, Says J. D. Crimmins

ADVISES SOBER DISCUSSION

Irish People Assured by Irish-Americans of Continued Interest and Support in This Country—Fullest Possible Representation of All Classes Is Favored.

That final settlement of the Irish question depends upon the democratic selection and complete freedom of action of delegates to the proposed convention, is the consensus of opinion expressed by Irish-Americans in the *Evening Post* today. The success of Lloyd George's plan rests with Lloyd George, according to one statement, "if the only matter at issue is the adjustment of differences which have arisen in Ireland under, and because of, alien rule." The convention should, it is said, ignore the past and look only to the future. The service of Ulstermen is needed, it is held, in the rehabilitation of South Ireland.

These statements were made in answer to a challenge issued by Capt. W. J. M. A. Maloney in the *Evening Post* of May 24 that American opinion on the Irish question be put on record in order to clarify diverging views and hasten a final settlement. He urged that answers to the following questions would give the desired information:

(1.) Are you in favor of a convention of the Irish in Ireland determining the plan of the future government of Ireland?

(2.) If that convention be arranged on a basis as equitable as is consistent with

the present exigencies of war, will you abide by its decisions?

(3.) If the British Parliament legalizes these decisions, will you loyally and whole-heartedly cooperate with the Irish Government thus constituted?

John D. Crimmins's Views.

To Capt. Maloney's questions, John D. Crimmins, of 624 Madison Avenue, made the following reply:

First question—Yes.

Second question—Yes.

Third question—Most heartily, yes.

"The impression," said Mr. Crimmins, "I have received from speaking on the Irish problem with many, many people, particularly conservative American-Irish who are sincere in their hopes and efforts for Ireland's welfare, is this: We all hope that the proposed convention will be held and that the exigencies of to-day will be discussed conservatively. It is not with the past the convention will have to do, but with the future welfare of Ireland and her people. We pray that there will be a happy and satisfactory conclusion to the work of the convention, and that it will result in the establishment of a Parliament in Dublin.

"The Irish people at home may be assured of the continued interest of those of the Irish race in this and other countries. I think I carry the opinion of many who believe in the wisdom and statesmanship of John Redmond and his associates."

Stephen McFarland's Views.

Stephen McFarland, president, New York Municipal Council of the United Irish League, made the following statement:

"We who have always argued that Ireland can only be governed properly when she governs herself are naturally pleased when it is proposed that Irishmen shall be asked to agree upon an Irish Constitution. If it were clear that this is to be what the average newspaper reader assumes it to be; if the solution of the Irish problem were really being turned over to the Irish people, we would await development with complete confidence in the outcome.

"With the information now at our disposal, we are naturally anxious to learn whether Ulster is willing to enter the con-

vention. That anxiety proceeds not from any eagerness to subject Ulster to any rule that would be unwelcome to her people, but from quite the contrary motive. The hope of Irish Nationalists has always been that when the time came for self-government the people of Ulster would bring to the service of the country those business qualities which have reached a high state of development among them when similar development has not been possible in the rest of Ireland. The prime objection to partition is that these capable Irishmen would be shut off from participation in the work of rebuilding the Irish nation.

Support Redmond.

"Those of us who have always had, and still have, the highest regard for Mr. Redmond and the fullest confidence in his patriotism and statesmanship, are glad to note that he seems to look for good to come of the proposed convention. We realize that he has been deceived before, and are apprehensive that he may be deceived again, but when he is ready to risk an attempt to get an Irish settlement of the Irish question we are steadfastly behind him.

"What we hope is that, under the prompting of America, England will honorably recognize the military assistance she has had from 500,000 men of Irish blood in this war, and that since America has come in on the side of the Allies, in the name of democracy, England will abandon her policy of disposing of Irish difficulties as if the Irish were only a little better than Hottentots, and will allow this convention to be really Irish, knowing, as English public men well know from experience, that Irishmen, whether at home or abroad, are capable of handling the most complex problems and disposing of difficulties with fairness and justice to all the interests involved.

"We in this country are confident that if the appeal made to Ireland by Lloyd George fails, it will be because of other than Irish reasons, and that it will not fail if the only matter at issue is the adjustment of differences which have arisen in Ireland under, and because of, alien rule."

Father Fay Hopeful.

In answering Captain Maloney's questions, the Rev. Father Sigourney W. Fay,

Newman School, Hackensack, N. J., wrote:

"As to the first question, I should say I cannot see how any one of Irish blood could refuse to answer it in the affirmative. Our whole contention for the past seven hundred years has been that if the English would let us alone we could settle our own difficulties. If it is apparent that the chance of settling our difficulties is to be given to us I am whole-heartedly for taking it.

"To the next question I should desire also to answer in the affirmative, provided that the exigencies of war are not themselves to destroy the autonomy of the convention. This matter will never be settled until every section of Irish opinion is allowed to express itself fully and freely in the presence of every other section of Irish opinion. In the past, one set of Irishmen have been played off against another.

"As to the third question I should say, most assuredly, if the convention is truly representative in every sense, and if what they agree upon is put in force by the British Government every Irishman in Ireland should abide by that decision, and every Irish-American should loyally coöperate for the new government of Ireland as far as his duty to his own country, the United States of America, permits him to do so.

"There are the strongest reasons for believing that the English people are at last convinced of the necessity of doing justice to the people of Ireland, that the matter, therefore, depends now upon the ability and willingness of Irishmen to coöperate with one another, and any section of the Irish people which holds out against the rest of the country to its own particular shibboleth will earn for themselves the unenviable reputation of having been the final destroyers of their country."

John D. Moore's Views.

John D. Moore, of 26 Cortlandt Street, a consulting engineer, for four years State Conservation Commissioner, who is national secretary of the Friends of Irish Freedom, expressed the following opinion:

"It is beginning to sink into the consciousness of the American people that it is England, and not Ireland, which is on trial in the matter of this convention.

The people of this country have declined the invitation to lose all patience with the Irish people and condemn them 'as absolutely unreasonable' if the convention plan fails to accomplish the purposes which Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Redmond have in mind. With us, not only direct election of officials, but also their direct nomination, is held everywhere to be a fundamental of democracy, and our people are strongly inclined to sympathize with the rejection by the Irish Republican element of the proposal to submit their national fate to the dictum of a hand-picked convention.

"As the chief spokesman for the Allies, England has been insistently preaching the cause of democracy. Yesterday in Ottawa Mr. Balfour said that the British Empire had 'staked its last dollar on democracy.' The American people are looking to England and expecting her to apply the principles of democracy to Ire-

land. In brief, they want England's words translated into action.

"America has proved her sincerity in this war, which she entered 'for the rights of nations great and small, and for the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience,' and 'to make the world safe for democracy.' She is giving of her men, her money, and everything that men can make and money can buy. A great many of our citizens realize that countless men of Irish blood will be found in the armies and in the fleets of the United States, and unless England permits the early settlement of the Irish question, these Irish soldiers and sailors will be fighting for democracy everywhere except in the land from which they themselves have sprung. This is a political absurdity so patent as to be repulsive to the American idea of a square deal."

(June 2, 1917)

IRISH QUESTION A WORLD AFFAIR

More Opinions from Men Who Are Interested

BRITISH PROPOSALS CRITICISED

**Secret Proceedings of Proposed Convention, and Appointment of a Chairman by Government Do Not Meet with Approval—Justice Min-
turn, of New Jersey, Gives His Views.**

In the comments made to-day for the *Evening Post* regarding the forthcoming Irish convention, three proposals of Lloyd George, the British Premier, are criticised—the secret proceedings, the ap-

pointment of a chairman by the Government, and the selection of representatives by the British Government. Universal franchise for the election of delegates; open sessions, and the election of officers by the delegates are advocated.

The questions suggested by Capt. W. J. M. A. Maloney in his challenge to Irish sympathizers in America to put themselves on record, appeared in the *Evening Post* May 24, and are as follows:

"(1.) Are you in favor of a convention of the Irish in Ireland determining the plan of the future government of Ireland?

"(2.) If that convention be arranged on a basis as equitable as is consistent with the present exigencies of war, will you abide by its decisions?

"(3.) If the British Parliament legalizes these decisions, will you loyally and whole-heartedly coöperate with the Irish Government thus constituted?"

Justice James F. Minturn.

James F. Minturn, of Hoboken, Justice of the Supreme Court of New Jersey, replied to the questions as follows:

"(1.) As an American I can entertain but one view regarding an Irish convention, and that is the view enunciated in our Declaration of Independence, to the effect that all political power is derived from the people, and that no country is

legally entitled to govern another without the consent of the governed.

Ireland's Fate In Balance.

"President Wilson quite recently in his message to the Powers has reiterated these truisms. It is to be assured, therefore, that no peace terms will be consummated in any conference of Powers in which we shall participate, without an insistence upon our part of these fundamental humanitarian principles of American political philosophy, applicable equally to Ireland, to Belgium, and to Poland. The Irish right to independence cannot be controverted by any consistent American capable of understanding his own country's ideals.

"If the Irish people, however, *upon a free and open referendum*, are willing to accept less in view of the present exigency—for instance, such a system of self-government as has been conceded to Canada, Australia, and South Africa—that modicum of national right should be accorded to them. England has found that treatment expedient, and to her advantage in those instances, and that experience, aside from the inherent justice of the compromise, should recommend it to her in the case of Ireland.

"(2.) The second inquiry requires only the remark that, when the people of Ireland indicate their satisfaction in any properly constituted convention, with the system of compromise that shall be adopted, we Americans will have no cause to complain. Ireland's case is the case of America only because it is the case of humanity; and when the Irish people shall have settled their age-long grievance in a manner satisfactory to themselves, the worries and troubles of America as well as of humanity will be correspondingly lessened and solved.

"(3.) If to this consensus of Irish opinion the British Parliament will accord the recognition that the voice of a people is entitled to receive, and transmute it into law, the Irish problem, in my judgment, will be solved, and America, as well as humanity, will rejoice."

Richard F. Dalton's Opinion.

Richard F. Dalton, treasurer of the New York Architectural Terra-Cotta Company, of Long Island City, writes as follows:

"Speaking as an Irishman by birth and as an American by training, I should be

most heartily in favor of 'a convention of the Irish in Ireland determining the plan of the future government of Ireland.'

"According to American ideals, such a convention would be composed of representatives chosen by the universal franchise of the men and women of Ireland; it would be convened in open session; it would select its own officers, and continuing its deliberations in the full light of the world's view—for, let it be borne in mind, that the Irish question has become a world question—it would accord with the best principles of democracy, and its decisions would command the respect and the abiding loyalty of Irishmen everywhere.

"But I see absolutely no present prospect of such a convention, in so far as the proposals of Mr. Lloyd George are concerned. Rather, I see a palpable effort of the present British Ministry to placate American public opinion, and to square with our declaration of purpose in entering the war, by ostensibly presenting to the Irish people an opportunity to settle their own affairs, the while making perfectly sure that no request forthcoming from the convention shall be unwelcome from an English viewpoint.

"It would appear from his second interrogatory that Capt. Maloney rather generously bounds the equities of the projected convention by the present exigencies of war.

"Most assuredly neither the Irish at home nor the Irish abroad will abide by the so-called decisions of a conference to be held in secret session under the chairmanship of a Crown appointee, a conference to be very largely composed of hand-picked men upon a basis of representation apparently carefully arranged between the British Prime Minister and certain alleged leaders who do not in fact represent Irish sentiment fairly.

"This statement may appear severe, but even the most cursory examination of the cabled dispatches will disclose that the Irish politicians with whom Lloyd George is negotiating at this time have one and all lost the conception of Ireland a nation. They enter the conference with the major premise of Ireland's maintenance as an integral part of the British Empire fixed as an axiom which admits of no discussion. Separation may be broached, to be sure, but any such suggestion must be brushed aside. Meanwhile, the British

Premier himself admits that Ireland is seething with discontent, and the recent elections strike home the fact that a majority of the manhood of Ireland has gone Sinn Fein—that the policy of Pearse and his compatriots of Easter week stands approved, and that the aspiration and the purpose of the Irish in Ireland continues

to be absolute independence—an Irish Republic.

"Irishmen of every generation for four hundred years have sacrificed their lives that Ireland might be free. Surely their claims cannot be bartered by a convention limited by 'the present exigencies of war' and other considerations."

(June 4, 1917)

IRISH PEOPLE ASK FOR SQUARE DEAL

More Views of the Proposed Convention

FIRE CHIEF KENLON'S OPINION

Monsignor James W. Power, of All Saints Roman Catholic Church, and Robert E. Ford, Editor of the "Irish World," Also Tell How They Believe Question Should Be Settled.

Additional comment on the proposed convention for the settlement of Ireland's difficulties comes to the *Evening Post* to-day in the form of letters from John Kenlon, Chief of the New York Fire Department; Monsignor James W. Power, rector of All-Saints' Roman Catholic Church, Madison Avenue and 129th Street, and Robert E. Ford, editor of the *Irish World*, and Prof. Robert Ellis Thompson.

The position of Irish-Americans and other friends of Ireland is being clarified by the response to Capt. W. J. M. A. Maloney's invitation to put their views on record. The statements published below are in answer to Capt. Maloney's questions, which appeared in the *Evening Post* on May 24 as follows:

"(1.) Are you in favor of a convention of the Irish in Ireland determining the plan of the future government of Ireland?

"(2.) If that convention be arranged on a basis as equitable as is consistent with the present exigencies of war, will you abide by its decisions?

"(3.) If the British Parliament legalizes these decisions, will you loyally and whole-heartedly cooperate with the Irish Government thus constituted?"

Fire Chief John Kenlon.

John Kenlon's opinions follow:

"We have been told that this is to be an Irish convention, and that the fitness of the Irish for self-government will be judged by the manner in which they respond to the invitation from Great Britain to frame a Constitution for themselves. Those of us who have a high opinion of the capacity of Irishmen will not object to be judged by the result of this test, provided that what is reported as an Irish convention is really that and not something else.

"This time last year Mr. Lloyd George presided over an abortive Irish conference. Later on it was shown that even if the two main sections of Irish opinion had agreed there were outside influences ready and apparently able to destroy the agreement. If that sort of thing is present at this time Irishmen are not ready to take the blame for failure if the convention fails. If a real Irish convention formulates a policy it is almost certain to be one that the Irish people as a whole will approve, and the more generous the safeguards for minorities the more certain it will be of acceptance.

"Men and women of Irish blood constitute the backbone of the democracy of America. American democracy is the oldest and purest on earth. We went into this world conflict 'to save democracy everywhere,' but particularly to save the democracy of Great Britain. We believe British democracy is fighting for the rights of small nations, but we also feel

that the British Tory is not animated by any such noble purpose; he is still the same old bird, the apparent change in his plumage comes not through the blood, but rather from external causes due to the refining chastisement of three years of terrible war.

"It has been said that 'Ireland paid the price of Liberty without getting it.' If this is an Irish convention it is likely to succeed, and we will all abide by the decision of the Irish people; if it is controlled by influences which have decreed its failure in advance, as happened last year, we will not accept the blame for Ireland or for Irishmen.

"We say to the democracy of Great Britain, we are in no mood to be jobbed; it will be well if they see to it that their Premier and his Cabinet are on the level in their dealings with Ireland."

Statement by Monsignor Power.

Monsignor Power's statement follows:

"Partition of Ireland is not to be thought of. The democracy of America is out with a pledge to save and redeem smaller and weaker nationalities. Only the other day in Arlington our President, Mr. Wilson, came out with the proclamation, 'America is born to save mankind.' The spirit of American democracy sits brooding over a warring world and the signs are hopeful that when peace comes back, all the nations, big and little, will enjoy fullest measure of human liberty, their 'inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' This is the glorious outlook, the spirit of American democracy, widespread throughout the world, holds out to all the people of the oppressed nations that have been robbed of their natural rights of liberty and human freedom.

"Ireland looks to America for her salvation and her liberty, and she hopes by the pressure of American public opinion voiced by our President that she will be saved from the disastrous measure of proposed partition.

"America herself fought the great Civil War, in the 'sixties, to save the nation from the inevitable ruin and destruction that the secession and partition of the Southern States would surely bring about. Her great statesmen and soldiers talked, and fought on many a hard fought battlefield of the late Civil War, until

this political heresy of partition was killed and buried. 'E pluribus unum' was the motto around which the democracy of free America rallied, and to that call we have the unanimous response of 100,000,000 free men, happy in possession of their inalienable rights of 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' Daniel Webster woke the nation to a spirit of high enthusiasm when in his speech on the Union, he rang out the immortal words; 'Union forever, one and indivisible.'

"The Saviour of mankind never uttered a more profound truth than when He said, 'A kingdom divided against itself must fall.' It was on this profound truth our great Lincoln took his stand, and held himself immovable until the nation was firmly planted on the rock of unity, where, with the blessing of heaven, she stands impregnable and unassailable against every foe from within or without. This is the point: If great America, with her broad dominions, could not afford partition or division, and spent blood and treasure against every attempt to effect it, how can a little nation like Ireland think of surviving the cruel blow that would inflict the open wound of partition, from which her life blood would ebb away against all attempts to stanch the flow?

"Irishmen all the world over trust the fair spirit of American democracy against so great an outrage as the partition or division of the Irish nation, after her centuries of thrilling struggles to conserve unbroken 'the spirit of the nation.'

"Secondly, as to the convention and its convocation, again Irishmen look to America for their pattern and model for imitation. Let it be representative, and thoroughly so, after the manner of the Lincoln ideal of a convention, 'by the people, from the people, and for the people.' A convention other than such as this would be a mockery to men or women with the crudest notions of liberty or the rights of free men. What would the revolutionists in 1776 say to the suggestion from an English Premier of a convention such as Lloyd George suggests to the Irish nation to consider, a convention whose chairman King George, with gracious condescension, would be kind enough to send them, with instructions as to ways and means, aims and

purposes of the convention and all its agenda and final decision and determination?

"Such a suggestion was never offered, and had it been the answer was beforehand in the defiant words of the fearless Patrick Henry, when the rafters in the old Court House of Virginia rang out the challenge that thrills us yet, with the immortal words, 'As for me, give me liberty or give me death.' The Irish nation has her Patrick Henrys, and today they are legion of that race and nation, who, rather than attend a convention cramped, cribbed, and confined by 'exigencies,' would akaken the echoes of that call for liberty and cry, 'Give us liberty or give us death.' The Irish question is not to be settled by a convention where exigencies of any nature will hinder full, free discussion by the freely and fairly elected and appointed delegates of all grades and classes of the nation, and where the rule of American democracy, of the majority to govern and decide all procedure and final issue, is not the accepted programme before the convention opens.

"As to the third point, all free-thinking Irishmen look upon the proposed convention as nothing else than a pitfall, an insidious scheme by which their last condition would be much worse than their first. The historic oppressor of Ireland is in a suppliant mood just now, and the men who are responsible for the guidance and high ideals of American democracy, in her mission of mercy to the oppressed of the smaller nations of the world, can, if true to American traditions, so direct that the proposed convention will be a convention of free men, in whose deliberations all may participate and by whose decisions all can abide. This is the devout hope of Irishmen at home and of American sympathizers here, and both alike justly think that America in her broad and generous spirit would only be paying a debt of gratitude in return for the blood and treasure poured out on the battlefields of America by the Irish of every generation to the last endeavor in the sacred cause of liberty and American democracy.

"I can see no difficulties as to a convention such as many Irishmen may object to as barring their way to attendance and participation, and they are the

questions of religion and the rights of the minority in that regard. This difficulty is imaginary more than it is real. The question eliminates itself, and, again, in American fashion, by a constitutional guarantee of liberty of conscience offered and accepted as a condition before the convention opens. This religious question is the bugbear and bogey of Ulster. Honest men, even Protestants who know the Irish people at home and here, know well there is no such thing as intolerance in the Catholic mind or heart towards their Protestant neighbors at home, and less so here.

"My testimony, that a Catholic priest, is too much ex parte to be accepted, but hear what James Stephens, the well-known author and man of letters, has to say in his latest book, and on that very topic, when he writes: "There is no religious intolerance in Ireland except that which is political. I am not a member of the Catholic Church and am not inclined to be the advocate of a religious system which my mentality dislikes, but I have never found real intolerance among my fellow countrymen of that religion. I have found it among Protestants. I will limit that statement, too. I have found it among some Protestants, but outside of the north of Ireland there is no religious question." (P. 136, "The Insurrection in Dublin.")

"Three-fourths of the population of Ireland are Catholic and if intolerance prevailed among them how is it that for over two hundred years all their national leaders have been Protestant. Here they are in succession: Lucas, Molyneux, Swift, Flood, Curran, O'Connell, Butt, and Parnell. Of these nine, there was only one Catholic, Daniel O'Connell. How far he tolerated clerical interference in Irish politics all know from the famous incident of his rebuke to Monsignor Quarantotti, vice-president of the Roman Propaganda, when he declared he was willing to take his theology from Rome but his politics he would be as pleased to have from the Grand Turk. So we can easily see how little real fear there need be for a Protestant in the matter of things pertaining to the civic and temporal interests of the nation. Besides the list of names already quoted, we have Wolf Tone, Robert Emmet, Thomas Davis, and a host of others all Protes-

tants and trusted and devoted leaders of Catholic Ireland. So at best or worst this religious intolerance is a northern nursery tale worked into credulous and overwrought imaginations of ignorant and bigoted sections with all the notabilities of brigands, thugs, titans, and Jack the Giant Killers that children fear.

If the innocent people of Ireland, Catholics, and Protestants alike, could rid themselves of the politicians, Catholics and Protestants, too, question of nationhood and convention would be a matter of simplest procedure, and if American democracy will only extend the protecting hand of her guidance we all feel assured that the day-dawn of Irish liberty and nationhood is nearer than we think, and in our generation the man may be living who in an Irish convention or Irish Parliament will address a free people and say as Grattan said once before: "Spirit of Molyeux, spirit of Swift, your genius has prevailed. Ireland is now a nation, and bowing to her august presence, I say "Esto perpetua". This time, in the second spring of Ireland's freedom, in the second birth of her liberty the appeal will not be to the spirits of Molyneux or Swift, but the man of the hour will exclaim: 'Spirit of American democracy, your genius has prevailed. Ireland is now a nation and bowing to her august presence, I say "Esto perpetua".'

Editor of Irish World.

"Your inquiry," said Robert E. Ford in his statement, "is essentially why the *Irish World* does not support Mr. Lloyd George's scheme of a 'convention' to settle the Irish question. That can easily be explained. A convention which would meet with our approval and that of the Irish people must be a free one. Mr. Lloyd George purposes to call a packed one. Do you believe the case of Ireland would get a fair hearing at a convention whose members were chosen by the British Government, whose president was an Englishman, and whose proceedings were to take place in secret? We do not. Yet that is what Mr. Lloyd George offers."

Prof. Robert Ellis Thompson.

Prof. Robert Ellis Thompson, of the *Irish World*, puts the situation clearly in last week's issue. He says:

with disestablishment of the garrison church, with the land, with railroads, with coast survey, and with provision for the poor, Ireland has had her own policy to urge upon the Imperial Parliament. In every case action has been taken because the Irish people have pressed for action; and in every case the Irish plan has been truncated with the purpose to conform it to English ideas and English interests.

"On the great problem of the constitutional relations of the two countries England originated nothing but the accursed Union of 1801, which is the root of Irish misery and discontent. The three plans for dealing with that—O'Connell's 'Repeal,' Butt's Home Rule, and Parnell's more complex programme—all have originated with Irishmen, who did not offer vague ideas, but worked out definite schemes for the future of the country. England's additions to the list have been free trade, the poorhouse, Protestant ascendancy, famine, and forced emigration.

"Mr. George proceeds: 'The Government proposes that Ireland shall try her own hand at framing a plan. This method has succeeded in Canada, Australia, and

"Does he [Sir Horace Plunkett] think that out of a packed conference of this kind there can come any result which will satisfy the Irish people? Does he not see how carefully England keeps the meeting in hand, lest something should come out of it that will not suit her imperial and industrial interests? Ireland's responsibility at this moment is to refuse any and every such contrivance to keep Ireland in subjection to British interests. . . .

"Premier George exalts his scheme as a new departure, in that it casts upon Ireland the duty of saying what is to be done. 'Hitherto Great Britain has undertaken all the construction; Ireland all the criticism. Once Irishmen are confronted with the problem, they will give due weight to the obstacles and difficulties.'

"Historically the statement is untrue, Ireland has furnished every programme for the amendment of Irish wrongs, and England has taken from her every programme and has handed it back after cutting away the really valuable part. In dealing with Catholic emancipation, with public education, with the tithe system,

South Africa, and I cannot help thinking that what has been accomplished there can be achieved in Ireland.' But were the dominions set up by conferences of nominees of the London Government, meeting behind closed doors? The conference which met at Quebec, October 10, 1864, was composed of delegates from the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Upper and Lower Canada (now Quebec and Ottawa), chosen by the legislatures of those provinces. The same course was taken in forming the Dominion of Australia and that of South Africa. Why should Ireland be treated differently? Why should the future be determined by a 'convention of notables' selected by Mr. George and his associates in England, instead of representatives chosen by the people?

The Question of Finances.

"Is Mr. George prepared to put Ireland into the position of one of the three great dominions, which have been formed within the British Empire. Far from it. Those dominions have treasuries independent of that in London. They levy what taxes they please to fill those treasuries, and they impose what duties they please upon British and other imports, both for revenue and for the development of their domestic industries. The Home Rule bill already passed for Ireland conveys to the London Treasury every penny collected as taxes or duties in Ireland, and doles out to Ireland what an English board thinks she should have to pay the expenses of government. Would Canada or Australia endure that arrangement? But Mr. George hints that whatever other changes the new plan may introduce, that is not to be touched. He expressly states that whatever the Dublin Government might spend, would have to come back to it from the British Treasury, and that precautions would be taken to prevent its getting too much.

"Behind this statement lies the assumption, resented by Irish Unionists, as well as Nationalists, that Ireland is not a paying country, and that Great Britain must contribute to the costs of governing her. It is the most impudent of the pretences used to bolster up the claim of right to rule the country. Ireland—as was shown by the commission of the British Parliament appointed to

the democracy of England on the Irish question. It was largely through these efforts that the burning question emerged from chaotic darkness into the light of practical politics.

"Meeting the English people half way we even consented to accept half our claim, viz.: Home Rule, not, be it understood, as a final settlement, for, as Parnell said. 'No bounds can be set to the march of a nation,' but as a first instalment—a step in the right direction.

"Passing over the years of anxious waiting, the innumerable disappointments as obstacle after obstacle was placed in Ireland's path to freedom, the failure on several occasions of the Home Rule act to materialize, we come to the year 1914—the year of dashed hopes. On September 18 of that year the King of England set his signature to what has been characterized as 'the meanest definition of a nation's rights that the wit of man could frame'—a Home Rule act which did not give the people of Ireland the powers enjoyed by any board of county supervisors in the State of New York.

"The American people will find it hard to credit the fact that the *Irish World* and the majority of the Irish people de-investigate the matter—has been paying millions into the British Treasury, for which she gets no return whatever. So of the outlays made to aid the tenants to become owners of their bits of land. It is constantly assumed that the British Treasury advances this money, and that it is a gratuity to Ireland to induce her to give up agrarian agitation. Not a penny of it has any such source, nor have the old-age pensions established in Ireland at the same time as in England and Scotland. From this beginning we may infer how far Mr. George will go in tolerating the imposition of duties upon English wares for the development of Irish manufactures."

"The *Irish World* for almost half a century has devoted its energies to the cause of Irish freedom, to aid that sacred cause, no sacrifice on its part, or on that of its readers throughout the world, has been too great. Tens of thousands of dollars were raised through its columns to further the movement for the liberation of Ireland. The *Irish World* led in the great educational movement which had for its object the enlightenment of

cided in good faith to accept even this emaciated act. But the American people will find it still harder to believe that this poor miserable 'definition of a nation's rights' was arbitrarily placed in abeyance until the end of the war and that it was proposed to saddle it with an amendment by which the curse of partition could be laid upon Ireland.

"Reviewing the Irish situation of the past decade, it is apparent that the Liberal Government used the Irish to strengthen their own position. They had to appear to give something in return for Irish support, but, at heart, they no more wished Irish freedom than did the Tories. The Liberals, indeed, were quite willing that the Tories should make it 'impossible' for them to carry out their promises. It must be clear now to the most unthinking that the Carson movement and the Curragh mutiny were staged with at least the tacit approval of the Liberal Government. Witness the freedom with which over a long period Carson was allowed to import arms from Germany, and the instantaneous order against importation on the formation of the Irish Volunteers. Witness again the complacency with which the overriding of the order by the Carsonites was received by the authorities, and the furious and cowardly massacre of the women and children of Dublin after the landing of arms at Howth. Witness, also, that the mutiny at the Curragh was approved by the highest officers in the army, that not one was punished, and that shortly afterwards all were promoted or otherwise rewarded.

"Consequently, it became clear to the *Irish World*, as to the Irish people in general, that England had not reversed her policy toward Ireland, and that perhaps constitutionally she is incapable of reversing it. Ireland, from the English standpoint, is not an allied country, is not a partner, is not even destined to be either. She is but a possession. A dangerous one. Ireland must forever be starved and humiliated, for England fears that, with prosperity, Ireland might insinuate upon and be capable of taking her rights. Ireland, therefore, is not even in the position of India. She is not a vassal to be exploited; she is a potential enemy to be crushed. This has been the position of England ever since, under the

Tudors, she reached out for imperial power. England aimed then, as she aims now, at being mistress of the seas. The control of Ireland is necessary for the attainment of that ambition. To control Ireland, England believes it to be necessary to crush her.

"The time, however, is past when England arbitrarily can decide the destiny of the Irish nation. Though she may not be aware of it, the supreme question already has been taken out of her hands and the martyred patriots of Easter Week, 1916, and their republican successors in Ireland to-day have placed it in the safe keeping of the United States and of those allies of England who are pledged to the principles of self-government for small nations. Resting secure in this knowledge, the Irish people look forward to the not distant day when emancipated Ireland will take her rightful place besides self-governing Belgium, Poland, Servia, and Greece."

(June 5, 1917)

TWO VIEWS OF THE IRISH PROBLEM

Nationalist Praises the Attitude of Redmond

THINKS HE HAS SHOWN WISDOM

Mrs. Hanna Sheehy Skeffington, Widow of Editor Who Was Killed in Revolt, Says that Irish Question Must Be Solved on International, Not British Party, Lines.

Nationalist and Republican opinions are contrasted in statements made to-day by Irish-Americans for the symposium on the proposed Irish convention. A follower of Redmond believes that his party has taken the proper step in ac-

cepting the proposal of Lloyd George for an Irish convention, while a separatist distrusts the offer, because it precludes the consideration of a complete divorce from England.

Capt. W. J. M. A. Maloney, who raised the issue in the *Evening Post* of May 24 by challenging Irish-Americans to put themselves on record, offered the following questions to cover the proposed convention:

(1.) Are you in favor of a convention of the Irish in Ireland determining the plan of the future government of Ireland?

(2.) If that convention be arranged on a basis as equitable as is consistent with the present exigencies of war, will you abide by its decisions?

(3.) If the British Parliament legalizes these decisions, will you loyally and whole-heartedly coöperate with the Irish Government thus constituted?

Views of Dr. Joseph P. Brennan.

Dr. Joseph P. Brennan, a Commissioner of Education, says that he has confidence in the Irish people and their accredited leader, John E. Redmond. Dr. Brennan is the president of three Irish societies—the Irish-American League, the Westmeath's Men's Association, and the Parnell branch of the United Irish League—and vice-president of the Municipal Council, United Irish League. He says:

"I am certainly in favor of a convention of the Irish in Ireland determining the plan of the future government of Ireland, and as an Irishman and a United Irish League man, I believe in supporting any policy that may be prescribed by the majority of the Irish people.

"This has been my policy since I have been able to take an active part in Irish politics, because I have absolute confidence in the good judgment of the Irish people and their accredited leader, John E. Redmond.

"I deplore the unwise attitude of men three thousand miles away who are endeavoring to dictate to Ireland and her representatives the policy they should pursue. We here in America should be the auxiliaries of our people at home, not their dictators, because it is quite evident they are more competent to judge than we are; nevertheless, they will wel-

come, I am sure, our suggestions and friendly advice.

"Mr. Redmond has accepted the convention proposition and believes in the equitable efficacy of its proposed representative feature, because Mr. Redmond wants to give a fair hearing to the elements opposed to him, as well as to those in favor of him and the policies which he represents. The elements opposed to him are not as numerous as they appear on the surface. For instance, the enlightened Irishman knows that the Sinn-Fein, the Clan-na-Gael, and the Republican are all one and the selfsame people, and under their various titles have been opposed to him and the constitutional movement for more than a quarter of a century, despite the fact that they have accepted the Gladstone Home Rule bill, which was in every respect inferior to the present one, which they so vociferously denounce.

"The Irishmen under the above titles now opposed to Redmond were, together with the Orangemen and Unionists, always opposed to majority rule in Ireland; therefore, their opposition at this particular time is nothing new. However, I am inclined to believe that the seriousness of the problems now confronting them will be sufficient to unite them with the majority in forming a plan of self-government for their beloved country.

"Ireland, on a promise, has more than kept faith with England. Will England now keep faith with Ireland, and will she, out of deference to American opinion and the success of the present war, make a serious effort to do justice to Ireland and settle the question of Irish national autonomy even at this late date, in a manner satisfactory to the majority of Irishmen and cogently encouraging to her allies in this desperate conflict between the forces of corruption and tyranny and the forces of morality and liberty—between autocracy and democracy?

"Ireland has given indisputable evidence of her sincerity. Will England evince a similar spirit toward Ireland? This is the question England must answer, and the one that will determine the future action of Ireland.

"Whatever will be accepted by the majority of Irishmen and endorsed by our representatives will be acceptable to me.

Mrs. Sheehy Skeffington.

Hanna Sheehy Skeffington, widow of the Irish editor, F. Sheehy Skeffington, who was illegally executed in the Easter rebellion of 1916, by Captain Bowen-Colthurst, later found guilty of murder, but committed to an insane asylum, telegraphed the following statement from Butte, Mont.:

"With reference to Captain Maloney's questions to Irish in America, regarding their attitude to the proposed convention on the future government of Ireland, in my opinion, Ireland would stultify herself by being a party to any such convention.

"It is being convened, not by Ireland herself, but by Great Britain, who will have a determined voice in its ingredients. The proposed convention is not from any desire to meet Ireland's just demands and satisfy her crying grievances, but rather from Great Britain's necessities and the exigencies of the war. In nominating the convention Great Britain reserves her veto. If the convention were to stipulate for an independent Irish republic, such a demand would be ruled out as not consistent with war exigencies.

"The progressive party is Ireland—the so-called Sinn Fein party—has already wisely decided not to enter the convention, and claims, instead, that Ireland be represented at the peace conference where her case could be properly dealt with as an international one by a jury of the nations. What would be Belgium's answer if Germany proposed a convention on similar lines to decide her claim? Is it likely that Belgium would be satisfied with such a solution? We claim for Ireland no less and no more than Belgium is accorded. Our problem is no domestic one, but international, and its solution must be accordingly on international, not on purely British, lines."

J. B. Mulcahy, of Butte.

The following statement was authorized by J. B. Mulcahy, editor of the Butte, Montana, *Independent*:

"I certainly favor a convention of the Irish in Ireland to devise a scheme of government for that country, the delegates to that convention to be elected by the full adult vote, male and female, of all Ireland without let or hindrance from any English source whatever, either as to the persons to be elected or the decisions of the convention. A free convention thus constituted will be truly representative and in touch with the wishes and hopes of the people, and cannot fail to express the national will—a bold and fearless declaration of independence of, and complete separation from, England by a tremendous majority.

"As the unselfish champion of small nations and the ardent standard bearer of democracy and civilization, I cannot doubt that if the Irish people should so decide, England would then declare herself ready to furl her flag, to withdraw her troops, and to abdicate her usurped powers in Ireland and permit the men and women of that island to direct its destinies in accordance with their own genius and desires. England claims this much for Belgium, Servia, and Rumania; will she contend that Ireland is entitled to any less?

"The manhood of Ireland will never permit the claim of the Crown to interfere with the selection of delegates to the convention, with the choice of its chairman, or the power to veto its decisions. Such a convention would be but a mockery and Irishmen either in Ireland or without her shores, would regard it and its decisions with scorn and contumely, and as utterly devoid of popular sanction and entirely at variance with those lofty principles of democracy for which England is now so valiantly contending. By all means let us have a full, free, and unfettered convention of the Irish people at home, and I for one will loyally and unequivocally support the enactments of any government that may spring into existence as a result of its reasoned deliberations."

(June 6, 1917)

IRISH KNOW HOW TO RULE, SAYS JOHN E. MILHOLLAND

HIS OPINION ON THE PROPOSED CONVENTION.

People, He Says, Should Be Allowed to Elect Their Own Delegates — Question of Excluding Ulster.

John E. Milholland, a former New York newspaper man and for many years prominent in political and social reforms, commented to-day on the proposed Irish Convention for the *Evening Post's* symposium. Born of Catholic and Protestant parentage of Ulster origin, and himself a Presbyterian, Mr. Milholland has taken an active part in the movement for Home Rule, whether led by the Protestant Parnell or the Catholic Redmond. "The Irish people," said Mr. Milholland, "will never be satisfied with anything less than a free, independent government. The exclusion of Ulster from the operations of Home Rule would be a bad thing for the country, but worse for Ulster."

Mr. Milholland's statement was made in answer to the challenge of Capt. W. J. M. A. Maloney, appearing in the *Evening Post* May 24, that Irish-Americans put their opinions on record. Captain Maloney asked the following questions:

(1.) Are you in favor of a convention of the Irish in Ireland determining the plan of the future government of Ireland?

(2.) If that convention be arranged on a basis as equitable as is consistent with the present exigencies of war, will you abide by its decisions?

(3.) If the British Parliament legalizes these decisions, will you loyally and whole-heartedly coöperate with the Irish Government thus constituted?

Favors an Irish Convention.

Mr. Milholland expressed his views as follows:

"Certainly I favor an Irish convention to consider Home Rule, and that at the

earliest possible moment. What man or woman of Irish blood does not? But is this what is now proposed? If it be, I fail to see it. All I find set forth is a proposition on the part of Mr. Lloyd George that a hundred or more estimable gentlemen, English, Welsh, and Scotch, as well as Irish, come together at Westminster, and in the shadow of "Big Ben" discuss Irish affairs.

"Much good may come from such a discussion. The possibilities are great; but to speak of such a gathering, whatever be its outcome, as representative of the Irish people in a comprehensive sense, in the sense that we understand national conventions to be over here, is manifestly quite beside the meaning of the term. To suppose the findings of such a group would have any ultimate binding force upon the Irish masses seems absurd, for it would be a plain violation of democratic fundamentals.

"Mr. George's intentions may be, and I think they are, the very best—for I never can forget his past record, nor the splendid, courageous fight he made at the risk of his life against the iniquitous Boer War—but the people of Ireland have not delegated him nor anybody else to pick out their spokesmen, and I do not believe that they will surrender this prerogative to him or through him to any body of men in the British Isles. Why should they? Have they not already demonstrated their capacity for self-government? Their representatives in London have been a determining factor in Parliament for twenty years, and who will deny that their influence has been almost invariably on the side of sound progressive legislation?

"Their County Councils—the first practical instalment of Home Rule—have worked successfully throughout all four provinces. They have been efficient, economical, and, if there be one authenticated case where the Catholic majority has oppressed the Protestant minority, or abused power, I have yet to hear about it. Ireland prospers and has always prospered just in proportion as her people have been free to manage their own affairs. The country then goes forward along strong, healthy lines, free from internal dissensions and that friction which can be invariably traced to outside interference.

"Having demonstrated their ability to take care of themselves, why not let them do so? Why should they not be trusted to elect their own delegates? Why not have a real national convention made up of the people's own choice; made up of men who will really represent the Protestants and the Catholics, the Established Church and the Non-Conformist, the Presbyterian and the Freethinkers, yes, even those who do not think very much at all? Such a convention would be in keeping with the very genius of the Irish people. They love bold experiments. Great ideas attract, fascinate them. They are only at their very best when called upon to do something daring, unprecedented, provided it appeals to the very noblest in their nature, which is essentially idealistic, combined with a practical ability that makes the race absolutely unique, a phenomenon yet to be accounted for in human history.

Is a Home Ruler, He Says.

"Of Ulster stock, Catholic and Protestant combined, and with ancestors who defended Derry, as well as Limerick, who fought at Boyne Water, some on one side and some on the other, I myself, a Presbyterian, somewhat intensive, have been a Home Ruler from the first time I visited Ireland more than forty years ago. I was in the movement when it was led by the Protestant, Parnell; I am in it now with increased devotion under the banner of the Catholic, Redmond, whose mistakes are of the head, not of the heart, and I say without hesitation, from a lifelong study of the question, that the Irish people will never be satisfied with any and the nullification of all national hopes thing less than a free independent government, and I say, furthermore, that, left to themselves, unhampered by the interference of outside politicians, Home Rule would be carried, even in Protestant Ulster, excepting possibly Antrim, Down, Derry, and Armagh, and even there the vote would be very close for, as things are at present, nearly 40 per cent. of the voters are for Home Rule in these four counties that I have named, and a fair poll will show it, and far more.

"The exclusion of Ulster from the operations of Home Rule would be a bad thing for the country, but worse for

and aspirations, the emphasizing of denominational lines forever. It must not be. Why, even in Derry County, more than 40 per cent. of the population are Catholics. In Londonderry City between 55 per cent. and 60 per cent. of the population are Catholics. In County Down nearly a third are Catholics, and even in Belfast itself almost 25 per cent. are of that faith. Why should these people be excluded from the operations of a great new national government to which they would be devoted. It is all wrong.

"Oh, yes, I am quite familiar with the general argument that Ulster represents the wealth, the progress, the business energy of the country, and all that sort of thing. Mr. Clark, of Belfast, rings the changes on this again in his interview published by the *World* the other day. But the facts are against him. Belfast, the heart of Ulster, suffers by comparison with Dublin. According to the Treasury returns, Dublin's gross annual value of property exceeds eleven million pounds, while Belfast is less than six million four hundred thousand, and Dublin's income tax, three hundred and sixty thousand pounds, is more than one hundred and fifty thousand pounds in excess of that of Belfast.

"Ulster's ratable value, per head of the population, is more than a pound above that of Connaught, but it is only five shillings per head above that of Munster, and actually nearly one pound per head below that of Leinster. Munster, which represents the extreme South, actually produced in 1912 nearly three million five hundred thousand more pounds in crops than Ulster. Munster's progress and prosperity are not generally appreciated. The late James J. Hill once told me, after a visit there, that he considered South Ireland's dairy system the most thoroughly developed in all Europe.

Ulster's Politicians Called Clever.

"There is, however, one claim to superiority that must be conceded to Ulster. Its politicians are the cleverest to be found in the whole island. They are men of absolute nerve; their audacity is unparalleled. The world has had an illustration of that that makes men still wonder. Sir Edward Carson, the acknowledged leader, led a revolt against

Ulster. It would mean its ultimate ruin, the English Government. He visited

Germany, had an audience with the Kaiser, and, according to uncontradicted reports, obtained what he wanted in the way of firearms. He made no attempt to conceal either his intent or his movements. His army drilled openly. He defied the Government. Yet he was never arrested, nor called to face any charge whatever, though his acts seemed treasonable in the highest degree. Instead of going to prison he was called to the Cabinet, and to-day is a dominating figure in the Government that he swore to oppose, if necessary, with his life.

"Sir Roger Casement, attempting, as he firmly believed, to do something in behalf of all Ireland, also went to Germany; also established relations with the Kaiser; also obtained firearms. He was sent to the scaffold, although the civilized world protested his fate.

"How these two incidents illustrate the political qualities of the majority and the minority, and how in the light of Carson's activities, the question of Ulster's oppression in the event of Home Rule, becomes a veritable absurdity!

"The people of Ireland demand Home Rule. Behind them in this demand stand the people of England, Wales, Scotland, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the United States, and the fair-minded people of every nation throughout the earth. Those who lead the opposition against this righteous reform are those whose forefathers voted against the emancipation of the Catholics, the emancipation of the Jews and the Non-Conformists; they voted against popular suffrage, against death duties, and every form of taxation that distributed the burden.

"They who oppose Home Rule to-day are those who voted against the Laborers' Act in Ireland, against the Plural Voting bill, against the bill to give compensation for improvements and disturbance of tenants in houses and shops; they were against the Small Landowners' bill for Scotland; the Evicted Tenants' bill; against Lloyd George's famous budget; against the minimum wage, the Trades Union act, against, yes, even against that concession of Home Rule to the Transvaal which has made South Africa one of the great fighting forces for England in this war against Germany.

"What Home Rule has done for South

Africa it would do with a thousand times more significance, not only in the interests of Ireland itself, but in the interests of the British Empire and civilization. This is so manifest to every competent student of the subject that further prolonged opposition based upon prejudice, stupidity, and traditional hatred seems unthinkable. It would certainly seem farcical, were it not so fraught with tragic possibilities.

"Let us have, by all means, a real Irish national convention. Let us have it right away. Let Mr. George's conference arrange the details of it on broad, generous lines. Then his conference will not be in vain, and the convention will be a blessing to the human race.

"Let us have an Ireland again free and independent!

(June 7 1917)

BOSTON'S MAYOR WANTS NO IRISH CONVENTION

JAMES M. CURLEY CALLS BRITISH
PROPOSAL AN "INSULT."

A Protestant Irishman Believes
Statesmen of England Have a Great
Opportunity to Settle Question.

James M. Curley, Mayor of Boston and a former Congressman and member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, is one of the contributors to-day to the symposium of the *Evening Post* on the proposed Irish convention. The opinion of a Protestant of North Ireland appears in the statement of J. Campbell Thompson, a lawyer of this city, while James K. McGuire, general contractor, of 220 West 42nd Street, and an ex-Mayor of Syracuse, also sets forth his views.

The symposium is the result of a call to Irish-Americans to put on record their opinions on the convention proposed by Premier Lloyd George, the challenge having been issued by Capt. W. J. M. A. Maloney on May 24, when he suggested the following questions:

(1.) Are you in favor of a convention of the Irish in Ireland determining the plan of the future government of Ireland?

(2.) If that convention be arranged on a basis as equitable as is consistent with the present exigencies of war, will you abide by its decisions?

(3.) If the British Parliament legalizes these decisions, will you loyally and whole-heartedly coöperate with the Irish Government thus constituted?

Mayor Curley in Opposition.

Mayor Curley thinks that the proposed convention is an insult to the intelligence of the Irish people. He says:

"The history of English negotiation, either in the matter of Catholic emancipation or Home Rule, is one long chapter of broken promises and violated pledges on the part of the English Government.

"In view of past history, it is impossible to conceive, by any stretch of the imagination, a fulfilment of the present agreement to accept whatever decision might be arrived at through a convention of the Irish people.

"A government that honors and elevates Sir Edward Carson for substantially the same character of offence for which it executes Sir Roger Casement cannot be depended upon to act either with honor or equity on the only demand which the people of Ireland are justified in presenting at the present time; namely, the independence of Ireland.

"To deny independence to Ireland is equivalent to repudiating the proposition that the present war is being waged to maintain and safeguard the integrity of small nations.

"Democracy, as Americans understand it, means a Government representing the will of the majority, and government other than by the will of the majority is not democracy, and enforcement of minority rule by the power of brute force alone is anarchy.

"To require the people of Ireland to convene under circumstances that render impossible a unanimous decision is to insult their intelligence.

"While the immediate granting of independence to Ireland might prove offensive to a few millions of persons of Irish blood throughout the world, it would be hailed as courageous, magnanimous,

and just by more than 20,000,000 of people of Irish blood and by hundreds of millions of lovers of liberty, whose respect for Irish character and valor is heightened by the knowledge that for more than 700 years they have striven for independence, with never a thought to run up the white flag in token of surrender of an ideal for the preservation of which they have endured privation, famine, and penal servitude, and given up their lives."

Irish Politics and Religion.

Campbell Thomson thinks that politics is at the bottom of Ireland's religious differences. His statement follows:

"As a Protestant born in the North of Ireland and a Trinity College man, I speak with conviction that the religious difference between the North and the South is as a political issue fanned and kept alive by politicians for political purposes. No doubt there was rancor in the past, but in the light of to-day's intelligence there is a great broadening of toleration.

"The Irish Protestant and the Irish Catholic are in Ireland good neighbors and in America the best of friends. If political conditions in Ireland were changed, there would not be any religious question. The Protestant and Catholic are equally proud of being Irishmen, and if they had a country would be equally loyal to it. Why waste time and court uncertainty by proposing a convention when there can be conferred a similar system of government to that which exists in Canada and Australia?

"The difficulties in the way of doing so are magnified, and if any exist, they should be swept aside in presence of the urgent necessity for solidarity of all parts of the British Empire. Not only would such a measure accomplish immediate results in Ireland, but, in my opinion, would be of the utmost importance to the cause of the Allies in America.

"Undoubtedly it is true that the principle of the Protestants, Wolfe Tone, Emmet, and Davis—that is, complete independence for Ireland—has a firm hold upon the minds and imaginations of the people of Ireland, and is espoused by the active and energetic men of the race in America. But if under present circumstances that be impracticable, I am satisfied that the patriotism of the men in Ireland and America would incline to

the practical, provided it secured to the people of Ireland a full measure of freedom to control their own internal affairs and develop their resources of industry and commerce. To all loyal adherents of the British Empire this would be preferable as tending to consolidation of the Empire rather than smouldering rebellion and eventually possible disruption.

"To accomplish this, an opportunity is now presented, and if it is not availed of by the statesmen of England, a fearful responsibility will rest upon them."

James K. McGuire.

James K. McGuire, who was vice-chairman of the Democratic National Committee in the campaign of 1900, and the author of several well-known books dealing with the economic side of Irish life, writes as follows:

"I have no faith in the labors of any Irish convention which fails to consider the advantages to Ireland of separation from England. The economic claims of Ireland are submerged too much in the discussion over politics and religion. The stress of war has made us think more of the political framework than the economic pressure to which the Irish people are subjected by the British connection.

"The Ulster Unionist taunts the native Irish with their poverty, ignorance, and superstitious piety, their lack of training or success in business, or their alleged domination by the priests of Ireland.

"In poverty and distress the unfortunate people have no sympathetic advisers in sight but their priests, and in the long night of Irish history the help and comfort of the clergy was the tie that binds. Access to the land in Ireland is making the Munster or Leinster farmer as thrifty, sober, and prosperous as the Ulsterman. The natives were driven from the Ulster plantations by invading armies, their lands were divided among the soldiers, they were deprived of education. Naturally they are backward in progress and utilitarian things, but time and freedom develop all Celts. We are told that the native Irish have no talents for business or administration, and that successful Irish emigrants are Scotch-Irish. That claim appeared to be true years ago when the native Irish landed in our land without money, education, or business training. But their children,

under the light of freedom and opportunities for advancement and knowledge, these children of Irish peasants often become foremost in many lines.

American Industrial Leaders.

"There is Mr. Farrell, head of the world's greatest industry, the United States Steel Corporation. Farrell is an old Connaught name, signifying "man of science." They were driven from their lands in 1689. There is Mr. Ryan, of the Ryans of Tipperary, head of our largest copper industry. Brady, Kelly, Grace, Daly, Banigan, and many others achieve marked business success which destroys the claim that Irish business talent is confined to a corner of Ulster. Give the new generation a chance and they will make good.

"The Home Rule act is a travesty as a measure of Irish freedom. Under its terms Ireland is forbidden from making tariffs, like Canada or Australia, to protect young industries. The proposed Irish Parliament is to have no control over merchant shipping, docks, harbors, coinage, patents, and slight control over land purchase and certain vital finances.

"After considerable study of Irish problems and relations with England, I am satisfied that, while the two countries might be friends to the benefit of both, their destinies are to be solved only by complete separation, with an independent form of government for Ireland. The object of the union of Ireland with England is to make the former country a feeding-ground for the English industrial classes. This policy prevents the development of Irish resources. This long neglect has left untouched many natural resources, so that Ireland, in her soil, is one of the richest small nations in the world. She has cheap water-power in abundance, coal, great peat deposits, from which gases should be generated. English coal is selling at \$16 per ton in Dublin, while the dried peat that competes with coal is selling for \$4 per ton in Germany. The Irish bogs utilized could furnish the cheapest light and fuel in the kingdom.

"To be saved to the world as a nation, to preserve her art, language, literature, music, and poetry, to be made strong and prosperous, to be saved to the world and arrested from national decay and death,

Ireland must have a free Constitution and an Irish Parliament created by the people of Ireland and responsible only to the people."

David Starr Jordan.*

Dr. David Starr Jordan, chancellor emeritus of Leland Stanford University, and for many years the active head of that great institution of learning, made the following interesting statement:

"The visit of Lord Northcliffe to this country, as head of the British War Mission, will be worth watching, Dr. Jordan believes, in view of the political situation in England. The Chancellor explained that Lord Northcliffe represents the new wing of the "anti-democratic" rulers of England, while Mr. Balfour, whom he succeeds, represents the older anti-democratic faction. The war, according to Dr. Jordan, has brought these two groups—otherwise natural rivals—together, with the result that the Asquith régime is ended and the Balfour-Northcliffe combination holds the whip hand.

Anti-Democrats Rule England.

"But the great danger in England today is the feeling among the people against this anti-democratic element now in control," he said. "Never since the mid-Victorian era has there been a time when the control of the Government in England was vested in such undemocratic leaders as those represented by Balfour and Northcliffe. Were it not for the war, these two factions would be at each other's throats, and once the war is ended both are destined to lose their power and the old democratic régime, as typified in Asquith, will return to power."

Largely on account of the influences now in control of the English Government, the latest move to establish home rule in Ireland will fail, Dr. Jordan believes. He is one of those who look upon the whole agitation with suspicion. The

much-discussed Irish convention, he said, was "dignified but futile—almost farcical."

"It ends in nothing, and is expected to end in nothing," he went on. "In plain United States, is a talk-fest—nothing more. It is just as if we tried to settle the negro problem in Georgia by calling a meeting of delegates from all over the country. A semi-official convention of hand-picked delegates from England and Scotland and Ireland is not the way to solve the Irish problem.

Delegates Should Be Elected.

"The only successful Irish convention will be one in which all the people of Ireland have an equal chance to select representatives, choose their own presiding officer, and draw up their own Constitution, subject to its conformity with the unwritten Constitution of England."

Asked whether he thought the Irish were fitted to make their own Constitution and govern themselves, Dr. Jordan cited Lincoln's remark that there never was any people good enough to govern another people against its will.

"Democratic government does not mean good government," he continued. "It means giving the people an opportunity to practice. And that is the basis of good government. If the people don't have that opportunity, then somebody else does the governing, and does so in his own interest. Every imperialistic government is unjust and selfish, and therefore temporary.

"The present controlling forces in England are absolutely undemocratic. The test of their democracy will come in the recognition of Irish home rule, which means the liberation of a repressed nationality."

*Dr. Jordan is not of Irish blood—he is probably of English extraction—but this statement by him is reprinted for the reason that it appeared as part of a general interview in the *Evening Post* of June 7th and states the views of an eminent, unbiased American.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 377 743 9

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 377 743 9

Hollinger Corp.
pH 8.5